DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 459 919 PS 029 987

TITLE	Sound Investments: Financial Support for Child Care Builds Workforce Capacity and Promotes School Readiness.
INSTITUTION	Southern Inst. on Children and Families, Columbia, SC.
SPONS AGENCY	David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Los Altos, CA.
PUB DATE	2000-12-00
NOTE	168p.; For the related action plan, see PS 029 986.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Institute on Children and Families, 500 Taylor Street, Suite 202, Columbia, SC 29201. Tel: 803-779-2607; Fax: 803-254-6301; Web site: http://www.kidsouth.org.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Change Strategies; *Day Care; Early Childhood Education; *Financial Support; *Labor Force; *Public Policy; *School Readiness
IDENTIFIERS	Access to Services; Availability (Programs and Services); State Policy; *Subsidized Child Care Services; *United States (South)

ABSTRACT

In 1999, the Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care, comprised of appointees from 16 southern states including Oklahoma and the mayor of the District of Columbia, with additional appointees from the other agencies, was formed with the charge of developing a plan to improve access to child care assistance for low-income families in the southern region. The task force received testimony from professionals, families, and representatives of the business communities, identified barriers that impede access to child care assistance for low-income families, and developed an action plan to improve access to financial aid for families needing and seeking assistance. This report presents the plan, along with supporting information. Chapter 1 describes the work of the task force. Chapter 2 discusses the reasons priority attention must be given to making quality child care more accessible and affordable for low-income families, including the positive effect child care can have on workforce capacity, the advantages availability of such care can bring to the welfare reform effort, and the financial support it can provide for early learning opportunities for children in low-income families. Chapter 3 presents an action plan setting forth 10 goals and 52 action steps to improve access to child care assistance. This chapter also includes descriptions of initiatives representing progress made by various states in addressing the goals. Chapter 4 describes planned activities for 2001 and beyond to promote implementation of the action plan goals and to address additional issues associated with improving access to quality child care. The report's appendix presents results of a survey detailing the state/federal subsidy system policies and procedures in each of 17 participating states. (Contains 56 endnotes.) (KB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 459 919

Sound Investments:

Financial Support for Child
Builds Workforce Cap
Promotes School Readin

December 2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kristine Hartvigsen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care
Report and Action Plan for the South

PS 029987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE SOUTHERN INSTITUTE
on Children and Families

This report was made possible by a grant from
The David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

Sound Investments:

Financial Support for Child Care Builds Workforce Capacity and Promotes School Readiness

The Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care
Report and Action Plan for the South

December 2000

Southern Institute on Children and Families
1821 Hampton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 779-2607
http://www.kidsouth.org

Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care

Alabama

Sophia Bracy Harris
Executive Director
Federation of Childcare Centers of Alabama (FOCAL)

Arkansas

Janie Fletcher
Director
Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education
Arkansas Department of Human Services

Delaware

Lynne Howard
Senior Advisor on Family Issues
Office of the Governor

District of Columbia

Carrie Thornhill
Vice President
Youth Investment & Community Outreach
DC Agenda

Florida

Pat Cronon
Executive Director
Hand 'N Hand Child Care Center

Georgia

Julie Sharpe
Georgia Child Care Council

Kentucky

Kim Townley, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Governor's Office of Early Childhood Development

Louisiana

Gwendolyn Hamilton
Executive Director
Children's Cabinet
Office of the Governor

Maryland

Linda Heisner
Executive Director
Child Care Administration
Maryland Department of Human Resources

Mississippi

Carol Burnett
Director
Office of Children and Youth
Mississippi Department of Human Services

Missouri

Gary J. Stangler
Program Director
Center for Family Policy & Research

North Carolina

C. Robin Britt, Sr.
Executive Director
United Child Development Services, Inc.

Oklahoma

Robert Harbison
Retired
Child Advocate

South Carolina

Candy Y. Waites
Director
Division of Children's Services
Office of the Governor

Tennessee

Natasha K. Metcalf
Commissioner
Tennessee Department of Human Services

Texas

Diane D. Rath
Chair
Texas Workforce Commission

West Virginia

Joan E. Ohl
Secretary
Department of Health and Human Resources

Southern Growth Policies Board Appointment

Tommy Deweese
Division Manager - Arkansas
Southwestern Electric Power Company

Southern Institute on Children and Families Appointments

Rebeca Maria Barrera
President
National Latino Children's Institute

Andy Downs
Executive Vice President
Kentucky Chamber of Commerce

James T. McLawhorn, Jr.
President and CEO
Columbia (SC) Urban League

Sandra L. Murman
Florida House of Representatives

Sarah C. Shuptrine, Chairman
President
Southern Institute on Children and Families

Staff Work Group

Glenda Parker Bean
Executive Director
Southern Early Childhood Association

David Denton
Director
Health and Human Services Programs
Southern Regional Education Board

Barbara Garrison
Children and Families Program Specialist
Child Care Unit
Administration for Children and Families

Luis Hernandez
Director
Head Start Quality Improvement Center
DHHS Region IV

Linda Hoke
Senior Program Manager
Southern Growth Policies Board

Barbara Ferguson Kamara
Executive Director
Office of Early Childhood Development
DC Department of Human Services

Desiree Reddick
Regional TA Specialist

Susan D. Russell
Executive Director
Child Care Services Association

Nancy von Bargen
Child Care Administrator
Oklahoma Department of Human Services

Consultant

Gina C. Adams
Senior Research Associate
Population Study Center
The Urban Institute

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments i

Executive Summary iii

Chapter

1. Introduction 1

2. Call to Action 4

   Why Invest in Child Care? 4
   Child Care Costs More Than Public College Tuition, So Where's the Financial Aid? 6
   Will Welfare Reform Succeed Without More Child Care Resources? 8
   Rethinking Public Support for Child Care 11
   How Support for Child Care Serves Local Economies 12
   The Benefits Few Employers Know About 13
   Does the Child Care Application Process Deter Families from Applying? 14
   Affordable, Quality Child Care is an Investment in America's Future 16

3. Action Plan 17

4. Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care Agenda for 2001 and Beyond 38

Endnotes 40

Appendix

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Southern Institute on Children and Families would like to express appreciation to The David and Lucile Packard Foundation for providing support for the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care. Special appreciation is extended to Marie Young, our Program Officer, for her support and leadership throughout the first year of the initiative.

The Southern Institute also would like to extend special appreciation to the following governors of the 16 southern states and Mayor Anthony Williams of the District of Columbia for their appointment of dedicated Task Force members: Governor Don Siegelman (AL), Governor Mike Huckabee (AR); Governor Tom Carper (DE); Governor Jeb Bush (FL); Governor Roy Barnes (GA); Governor Paul Patton (KY); Governor Mike Foster (LA); Governor Parris Glendening (MD); Governor Ronnie Musgrove (MS); Governor Jim Hunt (NC); Governor Frank Keating (OK); Governor Jim Hodges (SC); Governor Don Sundquist (TN); Governor George Bush (TX); Governor Cecil Underwood (WV); and the late Governor Mel Carnahan (MO).

The Southern Institute is especially grateful to the members of the Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care, who have given of their time and expertise to develop a plan of action that stands as an example of effective collaboration.

Special appreciation also is extended to the members of the Staff Work Group, who provided invaluable guidance and assistance throughout this project. They served as our brain trust during the deliberations of the Task Force.

Special appreciation is extended to Joan Lombardi for her guidance and counsel during the initiative and to Gina Adams for her assistance to the Southern Institute and the Staff Work Group throughout this project.

The Southern Institute is also grateful to Louise Stoney and Jane Daugherty of Stoney Associates for sharing their expertise and invaluable assistance in the design and execution of the Southern Institute survey.

The Southern Institute would like to thank the speakers and panelists who presented during the four Southern Regional Task Force meetings. They are: Gina Adams (Urban Institute, DC); Linda Hassan Anderson (National Black Child Development Institute, GA); Yeshey Beyene (Neighborhood Centers Inc., TX); Helen Blank (Children's Defense Fund, DC); Dennis Campa (Department of Community Initiatives, TX); Stephanie Fanjul (Division of Child Development, Department of Human Resources, NC); Janie Fletcher (Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education, AR); Colleen Gallagher (Community Coordinated Care For Children Inc., FL); Doris Hallford (Missouri Department of Social Services, MO); Linda Heisner, (Department of Human Resources, MD); Pennye G. Hicks (Gate City Day Nursery Association, GA); Barbara Ferguson Kamara (Office of Early Childhood Development, DC); Joan Lombardi (Child and Family Policy Specialist, VA); the Honorable Sandra Murman (Florida House of Representatives, FL); Doug Oakes (Coordinated Child Care, FL); the Honorable Howard Peak (Mayor of San Antonio, TX); Diane Rath (Texas Workforce Commission, TX); Ann Rosewater (Regional Director, Region IV, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, GA); Susan Russell (Child Care Services Association, NC); Debra Russo (Florida Department of Children and Families, FL); Louise Stoney, (Stoney Associates, NY); Jerry Walker (Kids Advocacy Coalition, GA); Peggy Walker (Senior Vice President and Relationship Manager, Bank of America, and Chairman of San Antonio Smart Start, TX); Jearlyn Ann Weaver (Douglas County Department of Children and Family Services, GA);

Marianne White (Bank of America, FL); Don Winstead (Department of Children and Families, FL); Tracy Wolff (Smart Start Kindergarten Readiness, TX); and the Honorable Leticia Van de Putte (Texas State Senate, TX).

The Southern Institute also would like to thank those individuals who served as moderators during the Task Force meetings: Andy Downs (Chamber of Commerce, KY) and Pat Cronon (Hand 'N Hand Child Care Center, FL).

A special thank you is extended to the parents and members of the business community who participated in the community meeting in Rocky Mount, North Carolina, and to Bill Potapchek (Community Building Institute, VA) for his facilitation of the community meeting.

Special appreciation is extended to Henrietta Zalkind (The Down East Partnership For Children, NC) and Alethia Willingham (Very Truly Yours, NC) for their assistance with coordinating the community meeting in Rocky Mount.

Appreciation also is expressed to representatives of the Good Samaritan Child Care Center in San Antonio, TX, for allowing the Task Force and Staff Work Group to tour their child care center.

The Southern Institute also would like to thank the child care administrators and child care representatives of the 16 southern states and the District of Columbia for their cooperation and responses to the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care Survey and for providing the Southern Institute with information on child care subsidy program policies and the application process in their respective states.

In addition, the Southern Institute would like to acknowledge Charlotte Brantley, Commissioner for Child Care, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, for her assistance and the assistance of her staff in providing information needed by the Task Force.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Never before has there been a more compelling need in our country to enact progressive child care policies. For now, our economy is healthy and employment is up. America's work ethic is a source of national pride. Americans also place family high on their list of priorities and want their children in safe, affordable, quality child care while they work. With millions of parents working at the lower end of the wage scale, and with many leaving the welfare rolls, assistance in paying for child care is perhaps the most critical work-support measure in which the federal government, states and the private sector can invest.

The inability of many families to pay for child care is a public policy issue with far-reaching consequences for southern states. To develop and maintain the workforce required to fuel economic progress throughout the South, greater investments in strategies that make child care more accessible and affordable are essential. To sustain the ability of families to stay off the welfare rolls, financial assistance in paying for child care is imperative. To assure that all children have greater opportunities to participate in early childhood development programs that enhance their readiness to learn, helping families afford quality services is basic. Yet, there is inadequate attention given to the huge gap between the price of child care and the ability of families to pay.

The Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care

In late 1999, at the invitation of the Southern Institute on Children and Families, governors from 16 southern states and the mayor of the District of Columbia appointed representatives to the Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care. Additional appointments were made by the Southern Institute and by the Southern Growth Policies Board. The charge to the Task Force was to collaborate in the identification of issues and the development of strategies to improve access to child care assistance for low-income families in the southern region. During its deliberations, the Task Force received testimony from professionals, families and representatives of the business community, identified barriers that impede access to child care assistance for low-income families and developed an Action Plan to improve access to financial aid for families who need and seek assistance. Support for the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care is provided by a grant from The David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

The Action Plan goals presented below address the initial charge of the Task Force. The Task Force recognizes that improving access to financial aid for child care is a critical component in an overall plan to assure that low-income families are able to obtain affordable, quality child care that will improve opportunities for children and their parents. Beginning in January 2001, the Task Force will move to the next phase of its work and will address additional issues that affect access to affordable, quality child care.

Chapter 2 of this report discusses the many reasons priority attention must be given to making quality child care more accessible and affordable for low-income families, including the positive effect child care can have on workforce capacity, the advantages it can bring to the welfare reform effort and the much-needed financial support it can provide for early learning opportunities for children in low-income families.

A survey of the 17 participating states was conducted for the Task Force to collect detailed information on the state/federal subsidy system policies and procedures in each state. Survey results are presented in the appendix to this report. In-depth discussions, testimony and survey data all contributed to the identification of issues and opportunities. The Task Force identified the following issues as barriers to child care financial assistance:

Δ significant underfunding of the public child care subsidy system;
Δ eligibility policies and systems that hinder access to public child care subsidies;
Δ the need to create employer partnerships;
Δ the lack of federal and state tax strategies, e.g., refundable child care and dependent tax credits.

Action Plan

The Action Plan developed by the Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care calls for bold action to make child care financial aid available and accessible for low-income parents who need and seek it. The Action Plan contains 10 goals that urge public and private sector leaders to support specific initiatives, including significant increases in child care resources, eligibility simplification, improved customer service, implementation of tax strategies and creation of employer partnerships. Fifty-two action steps that address implementation of the goals are listed in Chapter 3. Participating states have submitted information on initiatives that represent progress made toward addressing the goals and action steps. The brief descriptions include contact information.

GOAL 1

Federal, state, local and private funds should be sufficient to meet 100% of need for direct child care assistance, based on initial eligibility levels at 85% of the state median income. Redetermination levels should allow families to retain child care assistance until they reach 100% of the state median income.

GOAL 2

States and communities should broaden their child care eligibility and subsidy policies to meet the economic, work and education needs of families.

GOAL 3

Outreach initiatives should be designed and aggressively implemented to assure that families have accessible and easy-to-understand information on child care assistance and are provided assistance in applying.

GOAL 4

The child care application and redetermination processes should be uncomplicated and family friendly.

GOAL 5

Establish a coordinated, seamless eligibility system so that funding sources are invisible to families and support continuity of child care.

GOAL 6

Establish customer service outcome goals and set standards to ensure that all families are treated with dignity and respect and are served in an efficient manner.

GOAL 7

Design the subsidy system so that rate structures assure that families receiving child care assistance have access to all types of child care and disallow charges above established co-payments

GOAL 8

Create partnerships with employers to expand child care assistance for working families.

GOAL 9

Provide child care assistance to working families through federal and state tax laws.

GOAL 10

States should have effective, coordinated systems to guide child care and early childhood policy decisions and direct use of resources.

2001 AND BEYOND

The Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care will monitor progress toward accomplishing the Action Plan goals. As described in Chapter 4, implementation activities will include state site visits to each of the 16 states and the District of Columbia, a Southern Regional Forum on Child Care and a report issued in December 2001 on progress made by the states toward achieving the goals. In addition to implementation activities, the Task Force will begin to address additional issues related to accessing quality child care.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The inability of many families to pay for child care is a public policy issue with far-reaching consequences for southern states. To develop and maintain the workforce required to fuel economic progress throughout the South, greater investments in strategies that make child care more accessible and affordable are essential. To sustain the ability of families to stay off the welfare rolls, financial assistance in paying for child care is imperative. To assure that all children have greater opportunities to participate in early childhood development programs that enhance their readiness to learn, helping families afford quality services is basic. Yet, there is inadequate attention given to the huge gap between the price of child care and the ability of families to pay.

Following a series of site visits in 1997 by the Southern Institute on Children and Families to 17 southern states and the District of Columbia, it was apparent that child care agencies and advocates had been unable to garner the commitment of policymakers to address the unmet need for child care assistance. Thousands of families needed help with paying for child care and were not receiving it due to limited public funding of child care subsidies. They needed child care assistance in order to work. They needed it to attend school or job training classes. And they needed it to search and interview for jobs.

Discussions during the Southern Institute site visits in 1997 revealed major concern on the part of state agencies and advocates regarding insufficient funding for public child care subsidies, especially in light of the passage of welfare reform. In addition to the lack of public funding, there were few examples of businesses weighing in to help low-wage parents pay for child care.

To develop and maintain the workforce required to fuel economic progress throughout the South, greater investments in strategies that make child care more accessible and affordable are essential.

Subsequent to the site visits, the Southern Institute surveyed the southern states and the District of Columbia to identify issues related to improving access to child care assistance. The 1997 Southern Institute survey requested information related to policies that govern child care eligibility, funding and child care application/redetermination process requirements. A report by the Southern Institute published in February 1998 outlined the findings of the site visits and the state survey and led to the establishment of the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care in January 2000.[1]

The Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care provides southern states and the District of Columbia with the opportunity to collaborate on strategies to bring about more informed leadership, to develop policy recommendations and to achieve results in improving access to child care assistance for families who are unable to pay for child care on their own.

Support for the initiative is provided by a grant from The David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

A 22-member Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care guides the initiative. The Task Force is composed of public and private sector representatives from 16 southern states and the District of Columbia. Task Force membership includes appointees recommended by each state's governor and the mayor of the District of Columbia. A Staff Work Group composed of child care experts, as well as policy staff from the Southern Growth Policies Board and the Southern Regional Education Board, supports the Task Force.

Because financial aid issues are central to helping lower-income families access quality, affordable child care, the initial area of focus for the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care is improving access to financial aid through strategies such as public subsidies and corporate partnerships. Beginning in January 2001, continued support from The David and Lucile Packard Foundation will enable the initiative to facilitate collaboration across the southern region to address issues related to accessing quality child care.

In April 2000, the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care published a report titled *Child Care in the Southern States: Expanding Access to Affordable Care for Low-Income Families and Fostering Economic Development.*[2] The report presented a strong case for the southern states to place priority attention on making child care more affordable. Findings from the report are discussed in Chapter 2.

The Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care also surveyed the southern states and the District of Columbia during the summer of 2000 to gather information needed to make informed decisions on improving policies that govern access to child care assistance. The results of the survey are discussed in Chapter 2, and survey tables are attached as an appendix to this report.

The Task Force met four times during 2000 to receive testimony and deliberate on issues related to improving access to child care

Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care

Participating States

Alabama
Arkansas
Delaware
District of Columbia
Florida
Georgia
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maryland
Mississippi
Missouri
North Carolina
Oklahoma
South Carolina
Tennessee
Texas
West Virginia

Notes:

- For purposes of simplification in this report, the District of Columbia will be identified and referenced as a "state."
- Virginia was invited to participate in this initiative but declined.

assistance. The meetings — held in Georgia, North Carolina, Florida and Texas — identified issues and led to the development of goals and action steps designed to achieve greater access to affordable child care across the southern region.

Chapter 2 describes the many reasons the federal government and public and private groups throughout the southern states should move aggressively to take actions to assure that lower-income families have the financial assistance needed to greatly improve their access to quality, affordable child care.

Chapter 3 provides an Action Plan that sets forth 10 goals and 52 action steps to improve access to child care assistance. Participating states have submitted information about initiatives that represent progress made toward addressing the goals and action steps. These brief descriptions include contact information. Chapter 4 describes planned activities in 2001 and beyond to promote implementation of the action plan goals across the southern region and to address additional issues associated with improving access to quality child care.

A statement in the recently released report of the National Research Council and the Institute of Medicine puts into perspective the reasons efforts to improve access to child care for low-income families are of critical importance to our nation :

> *"The developmental effects of child care depend on its safety, the opportunities it provides for nurturing and stable relationships and its provision of linguistically and cognitively rich environments. Yet the child care that is available in the United States today is highly fragmented and characterized by marked variations in quality, ranging from rich, growth-promoting experiences to unstimulating, highly unstable and sometimes dangerous settings. The burden of poor quality and limited choice rests most heavily on low-income, working families whose financial resources are too high to qualify for subsidies yet too low to afford quality care."*[3]

Chapter 2

A CALL TO ACTION

Never before has there been a more compelling need in our country to enact progressive child care policies. For now, our economy is healthy and employment is up. America's work ethic is a source of national pride. Americans also place family high on their list of priorities and want their children in safe, affordable, quality child care while they work. With millions of parents working at the lower end of the wage scale, and with many leaving the welfare rolls, assistance in paying for child care is perhaps the most critical work-support measure in which the federal government, states and the private sector can invest.

As a nation, we are poised at an important crossroads. Will we provide assistance to hard-working families who need child care in order to remain employed but cannot afford to pay for it? Will we make prudent investments in our children's earliest care and educational experiences, proven by the latest research to enhance their future learning potential and achievement?[4] Or will we continue to tolerate patterns of underfunding that place millions of children — and their parents — at risk of failure? The way we choose to respond to this challenge has profound implications, especially for families residing in the South, where the number of employed women with children exceeds the national average.

Child care assistance is perhaps the most critical work-support measure in which the federal government, states and the private sector can invest.

Why Invest in Child Care?

It is essential to invest in child care because times have changed. In what the U.S. Department of Labor calls "one of the most significant social and economic trends in modern U.S. history," the percentage of women in the workforce has jumped from 28 percent in 1940 to 40 percent in 1966, and to 60 percent in 1998.[5] The number of working women with children under the age of six proportionately increased even faster in the workforce. By 1998, almost three out of four women with children were in the workforce (see Exhibit 1).

Additionally, the number of single-parent families, most headed by women, has more than doubled in the past 30 years. In 1970, 11 percent of family households with children were headed by a single parent, and today more than one out of four American families with children, 27 percent, are headed by a single parent.[6]

Ever-increasing numbers of American families with children, especially low-income families, now rely on the incomes of both parents working outside the home.[7] In fact, only about 12 percent of American children under the age of six live in families in which the mother does not work outside the home and is available to care for preschool children. In the South,



Exhibit 1

where 14 out of 17 southern states exceed the national average of women with children working outside the home, even fewer preschool children have mothers who can stay at home to care for them.[8]

Clearly, the 1950s image of the two-parent American family, with the mother as full-time homemaker and the father in the workplace, has become the exception rather than the norm in our society. Child care policy, unfortunately, has not kept up with the rapid increase of mothers working outside the home.

The importance of child care in building workforce capacity was stressed in an April 2000 report prepared for the Southern Institute:

> *"In many ways, the economic expansion that is currently occurring in the United States has been possible because of dual-income families. And it is child care that has made it possible for families to work. Subsidized child care is an especially important support for the service industry. Comprised largely of small businesses with jobs at hourly wages, the service industry is the fastest growing employment sector in the country. By making subsidized child care available to the parents who assume low-wage, entry-level jobs, government is supporting the service industry itself (which could not grow without a strong influx of new workers) as well as the parent (who could not afford to take a low-wage, entry-level job without help in paying for child care)."*[9]

In addition to building workforce capacity, assistance in paying for child care can provide otherwise unattainable opportunities for children in low-income families. Such

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

assistance supports the efforts of states across the South to improve the readiness of young children to succeed in school. The links between early education and child care are profound. Children don't wait until they officially enter school to begin learning; children learn from the time they are born, during every moment of the day. New brain research has underscored this link and demonstrated that the first three years of life are critical in children's intellectual development.[10] And longitudinal studies have shown that investments in pre-kindergarten not only can boost IQ but also have a lasting and sizable effect on school achievement, grade retention, high school graduation, special education and socialization.[11] But because so few families receive help paying for care, and financial support is rarely made available to child care programs, most low-income families have few choices about the child care they use.

Child Care Costs More Than Public College Tuition, So Where's the Financial Aid?

A critical issue for working families is the undisputed fact that child care is expensive. Child care, on average, is the third largest expense for all families with preschool-age children, after housing and food expenditures.[12] In 1993, the most recent year for which U.S. Census data are available, the average child care expenditure for families with a preschool-age child

Child Care Costs More Than Public College Tuition



Source: Louise Stoney, Child Care in the Southern States (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, April 2000).

Exhibit 2

was $4,108 per year. In each of the 17 southern states, the annual cost of enrolling a four-year-old in a full-time child care center is more than annual state university tuition (see Exhibit 2).[13]

Obviously, the expense of child care disproportionately impacts low-income families, who pay a much higher percentage of their income for child care than middle or upper income families. For example, an unsubsidized family with two parents working minimum wage jobs in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina or Virginia could spend as much as 40 percent of their income to purchase center-based child care for an infant and a four-year-old. In Texas, such a family would have to spend one-third of their income for child care, in Delaware, 47 percent of their income and in Maryland 60 percent of their income, based on the average price of child care in those states.[14] In fact, for a two-parent family with an infant and a four-year-old in which both parents work full-time in minimum wage jobs and earn a combined income of $21,400 before taxes, the cost of child care is a serious barrier to work.[15]

Child care, on average, is the third largest expense for all families with preschool-age children, after housing and food expenditures.

For single parents, the cost of the child care that allows them to work can be even more staggering. Single parents typically use more hours of child care per week to work full-time because they do not have another adult in the home to help them transport children or care for them in the event of illness or other emergencies.[16] In Florida, Georgia or North Carolina, a single parent earning a good salary in a service-industry job — one and a half times the minimum wage ($16,068 annual/full time) — could spend as much as 53 percent of their income to purchase center-based care for an infant and a four-year-old. Similar care in Virginia could consume 53 percent of a working single parent's income and in Missouri 63 percent.[17]

A common misconception is that many parents can use free child care provided by relatives or friends, who are often referred to as "kith and kin." But most families do not have kith and kin available to care for their children, and many of those who do must pay these friends and relatives to care for their children. U.S. Census data indicate that, on average, only about a quarter of American families use informal child care provided by relatives (other than a parent).[18] Among those who do have access to kith and kin care, one-third report paying family and friends for that help.[19]

What can be done to help low-income families with the child care affordability dilemmas they face? Public and private child care subsidies can help families pay for child care. The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) is the primary source of federal funding for child care subsidies for low-income families.[20] Each state qualifies for an annual amount of federal funding appropriated based on federal guidelines. To receive additional federal money, states are required to put up matching funds. States have discretion in establishing income eligibility levels for their child care subsidy programs.

A 17-state survey conducted for the Southern Institute this year collected data on state public subsidy system policies and eligibility issues. The results of the survey are presented in an appendix to this report. Survey findings show that state eligibility levels vary significantly across the southern region, from 42 percent to 85 percent of the state median income.[21] Survey results also show that states across the South overwhelmingly cited lack of funding for child care assistance as a major barrier to serving all eligible families.[22] And a recent federal report stated: "In 1998, states obligated all the available federal mandatory child care funding, including federal matching funds."[23]

The CCDF was designed to help states provide child care assistance to families at or below 85 percent of the state median income, but insufficient federal and state funds have been appropriated to help all families that fall within that target group.[24] The result is that, nationwide, only 10 percent of income-eligible families receive child care assistance. In fact, a recent federal study showed that not a single state could serve even a fourth of its eligible families.[25]

Nationwide, only 10 percent of income-eligible families receive child care assistance.

As shown in Table 1 on the following page, the underfunding of child care subsidies is even more dramatic in the South. Eight states — Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Maryland, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas and Virginia — provide subsidies for fewer than 10 percent of the families who are eligible under the 85 percent of state median income guideline.

An additional public policy issue is that even when low-income families obtain access to public subsidies, the co-payment amount hinders access to subsidies. States determine the amount of co-payment families pay. In the 17 states surveyed by the Southern Institute, the maximum co-payment families make ranges from 4 percent to 30 percent of their income. In 11 out of 17 states, the maximum co-payment is greater than 10 percent of income (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, Tennessee and Texas).[26] Arkansas is the only state that does not have a co-payment for families with income at or below the federal poverty level. The other 16 states have co-payments ranging from .07 percent to 16 percent of income for families at or below the poverty level.[27] To put these numbers in perspective, consider the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) criteria for determining eligibility for federal financial aid. The DOE guidelines would require a median-income family to pay only 5 percent of its income for college costs — and this is after the family has had many years to save for this costly endeavor.[28]

Will Welfare Reform Succeed Without More Child Care Resources?

The passage of welfare reform in 1996 ended the old welfare system with a major push for all able-bodied adults to work outside the home, including single parents. Subsidized child care is a major part of that effort.

Under federal law, states have the option to increase funding for child care by reallocating up to 30 percent of their welfare, or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

Table 1
Estimates of Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Eligibility and Receipt

State	Children (Average Monthly Estimates)				
	(1) Parents Working or in Education & Training (no income limit)	(2) Eligible for CCDF (if state limits raised to Federal maximum)	(3) Eligible for CCDF (under state rules in effect Oct. 1997)	(4) Receiving CCDF Subsidies (April-Sept. 1998)	(5) Served as % of Potential Eligibles (Col. 4/Col. 2)
Alabama	494,700	233,300	103,500	20,530	9%
Arkansas	348,100	180,600	100,200	9,240	5%
Delaware	89,300	50,700	22,100	6,140	12%
District of Columbia	51,100	31,500	31,500	3,850	12%
Florida	1,434,200	705,300	421,900	46,640	7%
Georgia	913,200	485,200	331,200	47,210	10%
Kentucky	427,100	170,200	90,800	25,010	15%
Louisiana	450,800	219,700	219,700	35,180	16%
Maryland	610,000	259,900	91,300	21,380	8%
Mississippi	364,600	185,500	160,000	7,870	4%
Missouri	654,000	305,600	129,400	42,600	14%
North Carolina	819,600	411,400	343,100	74,250	18%
Oklahoma	374,500	191,100	178,800	39,930	21%
South Carolina	466,400	231,000	115,200	21,730	9%
Tennessee	671,000	346,000	183,600	54,820	16%
Texas	2,309,600	1,161,700	1,013,400	78,960	7%
Virginia	685,200	348,100	216,300	23,880	7%
West Virginia	117,400	52,700	28,200	12,900	24%
United States	30,393,900	14,749,500	9,851,000	1,530,500	10%

Notes: First four columns of estimates were generated from the Urban Institute's TRIM3 model.

(1) Children <13 (or disabled and below state age limit for disabled) with both parents working or in education/training programs. No income limit.

(2) Children from (1), if family income below 85 percent of State Median Income, the maximum limit allowed under Federal law.

(3) Children from (1), if family income below eligibility limits set by each state (based on limits in effect as of October 1997).

(4) Estimated children receiving CCDF child care subsidies, April-Sept. 1998. State administrative data reported to Child Care Bureau and adjusted to reflect CCDF subsidies only. Estimates are preliminary and subject to revision.

Source: Excerpt from Table 1, Access to Child Care for Low-Income Working Families, US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, October 19, 1999.

(TANF), block grant to the CCDF. Between 1998 and 1999, states more than doubled their transfers from TANF to CCDF. According to transfer data reported during FY 1999, states transferred $2.43 billion from TANF to CCDF, which represents 15 percent of the TANF block grant.[29]

The National Governors' Association (NGA) in 1998 commissioned a special study of state child care policies as a means of implementing welfare reform. While acknowledging that additional efforts were urgently needed, the NGA found from the responses of 32 states that, "States are improving services for children by maximizing the flexibility of funding streams and encouraging the coordination of services at the local level. The flexibility provided by TANF and CCDF significantly enhances state capacity to promote collaboration and create more coordinated systems."[30] The NGA cited a number of effective public-private partnerships that contribute to the success of child care, calling the partnerships essential components of welfare-to work-policies. The NGA's citations included, as examples, programs in Florida and North Carolina.[31]

Research has shown that child care subsidies increase employment rates and earnings for low and moderate income parents. A study in Miami-Dade County, Florida, found that increasing child care funding raises the probability that current and former welfare recipients will find paid jobs. An increase of $145 dollars in subsidy spending per child increased the likelihood of employment from 59 percent to 71 percent for current and former welfare recipients.[32]

A study in Miami-Dade County, Florida, found that increasing child care funding raises the probability that current and former welfare recipients will find paid jobs. An increase of $145 dollars in subsidy spending per child increased the likelihood of employment from 59 percent to 71 percent for current and former welfare recipients.

During the early stage of welfare reform implementation, the Southern Institute worked in cooperation with state officials to conduct site visits to 17 southern states and the District of Columbia. Site visit meetings were attended by health and human services officials and community groups. Discussions centered on the identification of actions needed to improve access to benefits needed by low-income families. The 1997 site visit discussions indicated that insufficient funding for child care was a major issue for states. Participants suggested that the combination of insufficiently funded child care programs and the inability of many low-income working parents to pay the full cost of child care could undermine state welfare reform efforts. Representatives from all states visited expressed concern about the future, even those from states that were able to provide assistance to all families who were filing applications.[33]

Findings from the Southern Institute's 2000 survey of southern states confirm that subsidized child care is an integral part of welfare reform efforts. Almost all of the states in the survey took steps to ensure that families who are participating in welfare-to-work activities receive assistance paying for child care.[34] And most reported that they were able to continue to provide this assistance for at least one year — and often several years — after the family left welfare and became fully employed.[35]

However, as families leave welfare and join the workforce, over time they risk losing their eligibility for subsidized child care before they can afford to pay the full cost on their own. And families with no previous connection to the welfare system — many who struggle to make ends meet, often working several low-wage jobs — may never receive help paying for child care because they fall behind welfare-related families in the priority system that has been created to ration scarce resources. None of the southern states surveyed by the

Southern Institute was able to guarantee child care subsidies to low-income families that had never sought welfare assistance. Every state reported that these hard-working families receive help paying for child care only when — and if — funds are available.[36]

If working families who are clearly eligible for child care assistance have difficulty getting help paying for child care, families who are not fully employed face even greater obstacles. In order to stretch limited funds, some states do not make child care assistance available to low-income parents who are looking for work, between jobs or attending college to enable them to get better jobs.[37]

The message to families is that being on welfare appears to be the surest route to obtaining public child care subsidies. The public policy question is whether we want to encourage families to go on welfare in the hopes of obtaining assistance in paying for child care.

The message to families is that being on welfare appears to be the surest route to obtaining public child care subsidies.

Funding for child care can make the difference between success and failure in the workplace, and it can make the difference between success and failure in welfare reform. Looking to the future, directing money toward child care is a sound investment. Providing more resources today for child care will help keep families in the workforce and help them avoid welfare.

Rethinking Public Support for Child Care

In other areas of national and state policy, notably public transportation and housing, public support is viewed as an investment in economic development, not charity.[38] Yet too often, child care assistance is characterized as welfare. Even parents, consumers of child care, buy into the notion that only very low-income families can ask for help paying for child care.[39] Most families believe that they must struggle with their child care choices alone, even when the costs are staggering.

Unlike the costs for public transportation, public housing, public schools or tuition at state universities and colleges, consumers of child care services — working parents — pay the lion's share of child care charges. U.S. families currently contribute approximately 60 percent of the revenue for child care, government contributes about 39 percent, and private-sector contributions comprise less than 1 percent.[40] That is in marked contrast to financing for other types of public services.

For public transportation, including buses, subways and roads, user fees generally pay for only a small fraction of the cost.[41] In public housing, rents and loans are highly subsidized. Public schools are tuition-free to students. Tuition at state universities and colleges represents only a portion of the cost per student — and scholarships and loans also are available to further defray student costs. Transportation systems allow people to get to work economically. Public housing provides people with homes, stability and an investment in their communities. Public schools provide basic education for the next generation. State colleges and universities offer advanced education and professional training.

All of these areas are publicly supported based on the assumption that the services contribute to the public good. They are regarded as legitimate, prudent investments for the good of a productive society. The public policy question is whether we as a society are prepared now to place a far greater value on child care and elevate it accordingly on the public agenda.

How Support for Child Care Serves Local Economies

Investing in child care generates jobs and pumps money into local economies.[42] Child care is not another form of welfare. It is a vital support for working families with children. Research in numerous states and communities shows that the public support of child care creates direct and indirect economic benefits. The direct benefits include increased earnings and employment among parents receiving those subsidies. Communities also benefit indirectly from the earnings and jobs generated by the increased demand for child care services. Families receiving child-care subsidies that enable them to work also need fewer government-supported services than they did when they were unemployed or underemployed.[43]

An economic analysis of public spending for child care subsidies in San Antonio, Texas, showed that assistance to families in obtaining child care services ". . . is not only justified on humanitarian grounds but actually more than pays its own way through local economic stimulus and the resulting increased tax revenues to the City of San Antonio. . . . The City of San Antonio can expect to earn a simple annual return of about 46 percent on public investment in child care. In other words, not only will the program cover its own incremental costs, but the community will realize 46 cents in additional tax revenue for each dollar directly expended on providing child care to those (who) cannot presently afford it."[44]

In North Carolina, an examination of the benefits of child care subsidies showed that the subsidies paid for themselves almost immediately in real dollars returned to government through taxes on family earnings and employment and taxation in the child care industry. That return on investment translated to a net of $3,924 annually for a child care subsidy of $2,544 a year for a family with an annual income of $20,000 — or a 54 percent return on investment.[45]

In North Carolina, an examination of the benefits of child care subsidies showed that the subsidies paid for themselves almost immediately in real dollars returned to government through taxes on family earnings and employment and taxation in the child care industry.

Yet among child care administrators from the southern states who were surveyed this year by the Southern Institute, nine out of 17 cited "lack of adequate funding" as the single biggest barrier today to families seeking child care subsidies in their states.[46] Nationwide, 14.8 million parents qualify for CCDF subsides, yet only 1.5 million parents receive them — one out of 10 who are eligible.[47]

The Benefits Few Employers Know About

Investing in quality, affordable child care not only is good for the nation's economy, it is good for employers and the families who work for them, now and in the future. Employers who offer some form of child care benefit report higher worker morale, reduced absenteeism, increased productivity and lower turnover[48] (see Exhibit 3). A new Treasury Department survey of more than 1,100 companies found that more than two-thirds of the employers they surveyed reported that the benefits of child care programs are greater than the costs, or that the programs are cost-neutral.[49] The U.S. Department of Labor reports, "Stress and the tension between work and family are increasing. Major changes in American families — and the lack of corresponding changes in many workplace policies and practices — are the causes." [50]

A few employers are offering substantial child care benefits. Con Agra Refrigerated Foods — a company that processes poultry products with plants in several southern states — has established a child care initiative tailored to meet the needs of workers who earn between $6 and $7 per hour. Since most Con Agra employees work in shifts and live in rural areas, this employer has established partnerships with Head Start/child care agencies in several communities. Con Agra makes a contribution to help cover the cost of expanding the center's capacity and/or hours of service. The company also pays a portion of the weekly cost of care for each of its employees.[51]

Bank of America has developed a unique employee benefit called Child Care Plus. Employees who work at least 20 hours a week, need child care to work and have an annual

Reported Company Benefits for Offering Child Care

- **62% reported higher morale**
- **54% reported reduced absenteeism**
- **52% reported increased productivity**
- **37% reported lower turnover**

Source: Survey by The Conference Board, New York, 1995.

Exhibit 3

base salary under $30,000 (and an annual family income under $60,000) are eligible to participate. Based on their child care expenses, these employees may receive up to $152 per month per child in addition to their regular pay. Bank of America also offers benefits for employees with higher wages (as a Dependent Care Assistance Plan), as well as onsite and/or back-up child care in some locations. Turnover among employees who participate in Child Care Plus is half that of comparable Bank of America employees who do not use the program.[52]

Not all employers are able to make child care investments comparable to those made by Con Agra and Bank of America. On the whole, private sector investment in child care is very small. In 1995, less than one percent (1%) of revenues for child care and early education came from the private sector.[53] But employers are learning that one of the most effective ways to support the child care needs of their employees is in partnership with government. And their government partners are starting to develop some new and exciting initiatives. The Florida Child Care Partnership, outlined in Chapter 3 of this report, is one example. Initiatives in San Antonio, Texas and statewide in North Carolina also have been effective and are briefly described in Chapter 3.

On the whole, private sector investment in child care is very small.
In 1995, less than 1% of revenues for child care and early education came from the private sector.

Does The Child Care Application Process Deter Families From Applying?

The need to rethink support for child care must include consideration of how families gain access to child care subsidies. Simplification of the application and redetermination processes is essential to assure that eligibility services are efficient and that families are treated with dignity.

The state site visits conducted by the Southern Institute in 1997 identified application and redetermination procedures that presented barriers to eligibility. The findings are outlined in the February 1998 report by the Southern Institute, titled *Southern Regional Initiative to Improve Access to Benefits for Low Income Families With Children.*[54] Since that time, several southern states have made strides in simplifying the eligibility process. Yet work remains to be done to make the child care application and redetermination processes more family friendly.

Public support for services such as transportation, housing and public education is provided without the same stigma associated with applying for other forms of public aid. Applications for college aid are available on the internet, and a single, standardized application is accepted at most colleges and universities. Yet states typically require families who are applying for child care assistance to make an appointment with the Department of

Social Services, complete detailed application forms and submit numerous documents to prove that they need help. If the family is applying for more than one program in addition to child care subsidy, they usually are required to submit additional forms and go through yet another separate application process.

The Southern Institute's 2000 survey revealed many eligibility process barriers in the 17 southern states. Seven states (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Tennessee and West Virginia) require families to undergo a face-to-face interview in order to apply for child care assistance. In eight states (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Louisiana, Texas and West Virginia) income-eligible families may be required to reapply for assistance every six months. Multiple forms of documentation are required in most states. Even families who are receiving child care assistance are required to reapply when they move from welfare to work in seven of the states surveyed (Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, Tennessee and West Virginia).[55]

Many of these application and redetermination policies and procedures were developed to ensure that families receiving subsidies are eligible under program criteria. But each of these steps increases the likelihood that eligible families will not even apply for assistance. The same holds true for families facing redetermination.

There are several strategies to simplify the process for families. . . . Some include allowing families to apply by mail or telephone without requiring a face-to-face interview. Others involve minimizing requests for documentation and, wherever possible, attempting to utilize public records or documents already on file.

There are several strategies to simplify the process for families and improve access to the system. Some include allowing families to apply by mail or telephone without requiring a face-to-face interview. Others involve minimizing requests for documentation and, wherever possible, attempting to utilize public records or documents already on file before making any such requests of the family. Verification requirements for child care assistance applications also can present eligibility barriers for families. Identifying areas where verification can be reduced will result in improving access to child care assistance.

Our nation has made progress in streamlining the application and redetermination processes for benefit programs such as Medicaid and the State Child Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) without jeopardizing the integrity of the eligibility determination process. The findings of the Southern Institute's 2000 survey indicate that there are a number of policies that present barriers to applying for and retaining child care assistance. Simplification or removal of these barriers does not require federal approval.

Affordable, Quality Child Care is an Investment in America's Future

Child care is a crucial support for low-income working families, employers and communities. Support can, and should, be part of new economic development strategies for states. Study after study has shown that quality early care and education in the preschool years can greatly enhance a child's lifetime potential. But all too often children from low-income families are denied this essential "brain food," denied the opportunity to learn and grow at a time in their lives when careful attention from adults matters the most.

Each of the 17 southern states has made substantial financial investments in their elementary, secondary and higher education systems. In 1994, when these investments were compared to child care, the results were startling. Florida, which has made significant investments in its children in recent years, in 1994 spent 23 times more on higher education than on child care and early learning. Texas spent 43 times more on higher education. Virginia spent 121 times more. And higher education spending in Mississippi was 636 times what the state spent on child care.[56]

Children whose parents cannot afford child care often are left without the supervision they need at a crucial time in their lives. Friends, relatives or older siblings may be willing and able to help out on occasion, but these arrangements often fall apart or vary from day to day. All children need to have the opportunities provided by consistent, stable child care arrangements. For many children from low-income families, child care subsidies make these opportunities possible.

Making financial assistance for child care a priority will produce dividends now and in the future. Inaction will perpetuate missed opportunities that will be costly in terms of building workforce capacity, helping families avoid welfare and providing greater support for early learning that can boost school readiness across the South.

We can wait no longer to make the kind of sound investments needed to assure that child care financial aid is available and accessible to families who need and seek assistance. The actions necessary to achieve results are set forth in the Action Plan presented in Chapter 3. The Action Plan calls on federal, state, local and private leaders to commit to the achievement of specific goals and action steps. Making financial assistance for child care a priority will produce dividends now and in the future. Inaction will perpetuate missed opportunities that will be costly in terms of building workforce capacity, helping families avoid welfare and providing greater support for early learning that can boost school readiness across the South.

Chapter 3

ACTION PLAN

In late 1999, at the invitation of the Southern Institute on Children and Families, governors from 16 southern states and the mayor of the District of Columbia appointed representatives to the Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care. Additional appointments were made by the Southern Institute and by the Southern Growth Policies Board. During ongoing discussions convened throughout 2000, the Task Force developed an Action Plan, which is set forth below.

The charge to the Task Force was to collaborate in the development of a plan of action to improve access to child care assistance for low-income families in the southern region. During its deliberations, the Task Force received testimony from professionals, families and representatives of the business community, identified barriers that impede access to child care assistance for low-income families and developed an Action Plan to improve access to financial aid for families who need and seek assistance.

The Action Plan presented below addresses the initial charge of the Task Force. The Task Force recognizes that improving access to financial aid for child care is a critical component in an overall plan to assure that low-income families are able to obtain affordable, quality child care that will improve opportunities for children and their parents. Beginning in January 2001, the Task Force will move to the next phase of its work and will address additional issues that affect access to affordable, quality child care.

Chapter 2 of this report discussed the many reasons why priority attention must be given to making quality child care more accessible and affordable for low-income families, including the positive effect child care can have on workforce capacity, the advantages it can bring to the welfare reform effort and the much needed financial support it can provide for early learning opportunities for children in low-income families. Issues identified by the Task Force as barriers to child care financial assistance include the significant underfunding of the public child care subsidy system, eligibility policies and systems that hinder access to public child care subsidies, the need to create employer partnerships, and the lack of refundable child care and dependent tax credits.

The following Action Plan expresses the position of the Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care that bold action is needed to make child care financial aid available and accessible for low-income parents who need and seek it. The 10 goals and 52 action steps call on public and private sector leaders to support specific initiatives, including significant increases in child care resources, eligibility simplification, improved customer services, implementation of tax strategies and creation of employer partnerships. Participating states have submitted information on initiatives that represent progress made toward addressing the goals and action steps. These brief descriptions include contact information.

The Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care will monitor progress toward accomplishing the Action Plan goals. As outlined in Chapter 4, implementation activities will include state site visits to each of the 16 states and the District of Columbia, a Southern Regional Forum on Child Care and a report issued in December 2001 outlining the results of state efforts to achieve the goals.

GOAL 1

Federal, state, local and private funds should be sufficient to meet 100% of need for direct child care assistance, based on initial eligibility levels at 85% of the state median income. Redetermination levels should allow families to retain child care assistance until they reach 100% of the state median income.

Action Steps

1.1. Educate federal and state policymakers on the need for action.
1.2. Educate the business community on the need for leadership in achieving state, federal and community resources to meet 100% of need.
1.3. Increase federal funding for the Child Care Development Fund to fulfill current policy allowing federal matching funds for child care assistance up to 85% of the state median income.
1.4. Increase state funding to provide child care subsidies to all eligible families who seek child care assistance.
1.5. Mobilize federal, state and community resources in support of families who need child care assistance.

West Virginia

In October 2000, West Virginia's child care eligibility was increased from 150% to 200% of the Federal Poverty Level (57% to 77% of State Median Income, respectively). The maximum monthly gross income for a family of four increased from $2,087 to $2,842. West Virginia's child care policy allows subsidies to cover sleep time for parents who must work night shift and study time for parents attending educational or training programs. The state also pays for two providers when necessary to meet a family's needs. Eligibility guidelines also were revised to benefit foster and adoptive families. Foster family income is not used in determining eligibility for foster children, and adoption subsidies are disregarded as income.

Contact:
Kay Tilton, Director, Child Day Care Services
Department of Health and Human Resources
(304) 558-7980
ktilton@wvdhhr.org

GOAL 2

States and communities should broaden their child care eligibility and subsidy policies to meet the economic, work and education needs of families.

Action Steps

2.1. Establish co-payments not to exceed 10% of gross family income.
2.2. Provide child care assistance to students who qualify under the income guidelines.
2.3. Explore broad use of income exemptions to address affordability of child care.
2.4. Eliminate asset testing (e.g. automobile or savings account) from criteria for child care assistance.
2.5. Index income eligibility levels for inflation.

Kentucky

Kentucky now serves families at 165% of the Federal Poverty Level. Co-payments of families do not exceed 10% of the family's gross income. Kentucky provides child care assistance to students based on their income and serves all teen parents working on their GED, regardless of income. In Kentucky, income eligibility is indexed for inflation based on updated federal poverty guidelines. No asset tests are required.

Contact:
Dana Jackson, Director
Division of Child Care
(502) 564-2611
Dana.Jackson@mail.state.ky.us

Mississippi

Mississippi's co-payment fees do not exceed 8% of family income. In addition, Mississippi recently amended its state CCDF plan to allow full-time students to be eligible for child care assistance without also having to meet a work requirement, to only use employment income when determining eligibility and to update State Median Income levels every two years for purposes of setting the 85% SMI eligibility ceiling. No asset tests are required.

Contact:
Carol Burnett, Director
Office of Children and Youth
(601) 359-5238
cburnett@mdhs.state.ms.us

North Carolina

North Carolina's subsidized child care policies support the education and employment of the state's low-income families. Child care is available to support post-secondary education for up to two years. Families are eligible for services whether employed full-time or part-time, when seeking employment or while in-between jobs. In 1996, a new fee structure was implemented that based co-payments on 7% to 9% of the family's gross monthly income, depending on family size. TANF cash assistance payments and assets are not considered as countable income when determining eligibility or the amount of the co-payment. In 1996, North Carolina also increased its income-eligibility limits to 75% of State Median Income (up to 214% of the federal poverty level for a family of four). This allowed more low-income families to receive services through expanded eligibility.

Contact:
Nancy Guy, Program Operations Section Chief
NC Division of Child Development
(919) 662-4561

Oklahoma

In Oklahoma, families earning up to 77% of the State Median Income, or $2,420 per month, are eligible to participate in the child care assistance program. There is a family co-payment rather than a per-child co-payment. Parents earning less than $855 per month have no co-payment, while parents with a maximum co-payment would pay 9% of income after earned income deductions are applied. Income-eligible students can receive assistance while attending high school, technical training or college to receive a bachelor's degree. Oklahoma's child care policy allows subsidies to cover sleep time for parents who work a night shift. Consistent with food stamp policy, parents receive a work expense disregard of 20% of earned income. There are approximately 18 other sources of income that are disregarded when determining a parent's eligibility for child care assistance. No asset tests are required.

Contact:
Susan Hall, Family Support Services
Oklahoma Department of Human Services
(405) 521-3931
susan.hall@okdhs.org

GOAL 3

Outreach initiatives should be designed and aggressively implemented to assure that families have accessible and easy-to-understand information on child care assistance and are provided assistance in applying.

Action Steps

3.1. Provide information on child care subsidies through multiple sources, venues and the media.
3.2. Ensure that information is accurate, family friendly, employer friendly, culturally sensitive and provided in multiple languages, as appropriate.
3.3. Present information in a manner that would remove the stigma associated with receiving subsidies.
3.4. Provide literature and assistance to help parents make informed provider choices.
3.5. Coordinate ongoing and strategic outreach activities among common organizations and providers.
3.6. Offer cross-training and information to providers, community organizations, faith organizations and state agencies to inform them about child care assistance programs and how to assist families in filing applications.

District of Columbia

In 1999 the Office of Early Childhood Development (OECD) prepared a plan titled "Outreach to Increase Access to Child Care Financial Aid" and launched a multi-faceted outreach campaign that included: broad-based community outreach (radio and television spots, posters); multi-agency cross-training (orientation and information packets for all government human resource managers); development of a list of liaisons that refer children to the child care subsidy program; appeals to existing providers (regarding referrals to OECD, distribution of information, allow OECD to use up to 95% of their current licensed capacity); targeted recruitment initiatives; community-based intake activities; initiatives in two wards with the highest level of poverty, largest number of children and highest percentage of TANF; and monitoring and evaluation activities.

Contact: Barbara Ferguson Kamara, Executive Director
Office of Early Childhood Development
(202)727-1839
bkamara@dhs.dcgov.org

West Virginia

West Virginia is providing grants to each Child Care Resource and Referral agency to implement a Traveling Resource and Information Library System (TRAILS). Mobile library vans will be used to provide resources to current providers, to furnish information to potential providers and to perform community outreach informing parents about the availability of child care assistance and to educate parents in the selection of quality child care providers. These vans are designed to be highly visible for use in community events. Multi-media material will be utilized.

Contact:
Kay Tilton, Director, Child Day Care Services
Department of Health and Human Resources
(304) 558-7980
ktilton@wvdhhr.org

GOAL 4

The child care application and redetermination processes should be uncomplicated and family friendly.

Action Steps

4.1. Simplify applications for child care assistance.
4.2. Allow filing by mail, phone, fax or internet.
4.3. Minimize requests for documentation at initial application and utilize documents already on file.
4.4. Provide applications at multiple sites.
4.5. Offer non-conventional hours of operation for eligibility offices and provide toll-free phone lines to include evening and weekend hours.
4.6. Explore presumptive eligibility or otherwise provide immediate eligibility contingent upon final approval.
4.7. Eliminate requirements for a face-to-face interview both for initial application and for redetermination.
4.8. Provide consultation on making appropriate choices when excessive requests for provider changes are filed.
4.9. Establish a 12-month redetermination period where there are no changes in income or job status.
4.10. Continue eligibility for full subsidy for 12 weeks if family loses employment but can document that a job search is underway.

Maryland

Maryland created a simple accessible child care application and redetermination process by uniting programs that benefit low-income families under the Department of Human Resources (DHR) for "one-stop" seamless services. Local departments of social services are the single point of contact for families needing many types of assistance, including child care, TANF, Food Stamps, Medicaid, child welfare and child support. Access to child care licensing and resource and referral services is provided. Service is simplified in the following ways: by providing applications for TANF and child care in work opportunity offices and community district offices; by using a one-page, mail-in application; by allowing up to 12 months before redetermination is required; and by employing an automated system that determines eligibility, issues vouchers online and accesses needed documentation from other programs electronically.

Contact:
Linda Heisner, Executive Director
Child Care Administration
(410) 767-7128
lheisner@dhr.state.md.us

Mississippi

Mississippi recently amended its Child Care and Development Fund state plan to simplify the application process and reduce barriers faced by parents seeking child care assistance. Specifically, Mississippi reduced the number of documents parents must obtain and attach to their applications from six to one. In addition, Mississippi went from six-month to 12-month eligibility determination, thus improving children's child care experiences by reducing interruptions in service.

Contact:
Carol Burnett, Director
Office of Children and Youth
(601) 359-5238
cburnett@mdhs.state.ms.us

Oklahoma

Oklahoma's expedited eligibility process requires the social services specialist to process an application immediately when the applicant does not have the money to pay toward the cost of child care and the applicant is in danger of losing a job or cannot start a new job. The social services specialist attempts to verify need and income through collateral contacts and documents the attempt. If the social services specialist is unsuccessful in verifying these or any other factors of eligibility, the client's statement is used to certify the application for a maximum of 30 calendar days. The social services specialist gives the client a form requesting any outstanding verification needed to establish eligibility within the 30 days time frame before further child care is authorized.

Contact:
Susan Hall, Family Support Services
Oklahoma Department of Human Services
(405) 521-3931
susan.hall@okdhs.org

South Carolina

South Carolina's ABC Child Care Program application can be completed by parents in the privacy of their home. Toll-free phone lines with extended hours are available. No face-to-face interview is required, and parents can return applications by mail. Parents are asked to verify or document their work, school or training activities; however all other information provided on the child care application is self-declared and accepted. Redetermination for non-welfare, low-income families is required every 12 months and is fully automated. Sixty days before the end of the 12-month eligibility period, the clients are sent a completed application based on their last eligibility determination. The form is accompanied by a request that parents update the application based on changes that have occurred and return the application by mail. The ABC Child Care program allows for seamless eligibility for families moving from Family Independence (the state's TANF program) to their first year of Transitional Child Care. Parents are not required to complete and sign a new child care application. Clients may continue to receive services for 30 calendar days if the family loses employment.

Contact:
Kitty Casoli, Department Head
SC Department of Health and Human Services
(803) 898-2570
casoli@dhhs.state.sc.us

GOAL 5

Establish a coordinated, seamless eligibility system so that funding sources are invisible to families and support continuity of child care.

Action Steps

5.1. Eliminate the need for families to reapply when eligibility categories change by automatically searching to exhaust all eligibility categories before closing cases.
5.2. Explore the potential for policy and procedural changes to achieve linkages with or combined applications for child care assistance, Head Start , Pre-K and Title I.
5.3. Continue eligibility in programs with multiple funding sources to assure continuity of care in the event that eligibility has expired or terminated in one program.
5.4. Work collaboratively with all public and private programs and funding sources to assure that children receive stable and consistent early child care services.

Florida

Effective July 1, 2001, Florida will establish a web-based Simplified Point of Entry System and a Unified Waiting List that allows parental choice. Families will fill out one application for all wait-listed programs. The system will begin with access to Subsidized Child Care, Pre-Kindergarten, and Head Start. Because the system is web-based, it can be easily expanded and adapted to include other family support programs. If there are no vacancies in one program, the child will automatically be referred to other programs for which the child is eligible. Families will only have to place themselves on one list. The family can use a public library computer or home computer to self-enter their application, or a professional caseworker or family support screener can assist parents in completing the application.

Contact:
Susan Muenchow, Executive Director
The Florida Partnership for School Readiness
(850) 488-0337
muenchs@eog.state.fl.us

North Carolina

Before 1996, North Carolina's child care funds were administered by two agencies, depending on whether child care was AFDC-related. Although the portal of entry was the same (local departments of social services), the application processes, eligibility requirements, parent fees and payment systems were separate and different. Some families lost child care assistance when they moved from one system to the other. After welfare reform, North Carolina consolidated all funds under one agency, including CCDF, Head Start Wrap-Around, TANF transfer, state Smart Start subsidy and state CCDF matching funds. Uniform eligibility, fee and payment requirements were established. The funding stream that pays for child care is determined at the state level and changed as needed. More families are served, and MOE funding requirements are tracked more efficiently.

Contact:
Nancy Guy, Program Operations Section Chief
NC Division of Child Development
(919) 662-4561

Missouri

In Missouri, eligibility is streamlined, and has been since inception, into one subsidy program based on two factors: income and need for child care. Depending upon availability of funding, priorities are established for who will receive services. Everyone applies and has eligibility determined under the same guidelines.

Contact:
Doris Hallford, Assistant Deputy Director
Missouri Division of Family Services
(573) 522-1385
dhallfor@mail.state.mo.us

GOAL 6

Establish customer service outcome goals and set standards to ensure that all families are treated with dignity and respect and are served in an efficient manner.

Action Steps

6.1. Provide professional and well-trained eligibility staff who are culturally and linguistically sensitive.
6.2. Facilitate quick eligibility determination through reasonable caseloads and/or administrative structure.
6.3. Conduct periodic, independent and thorough consumer satisfaction assessments, assuring the confidentiality of information collected.
6.4. Provide adequate support for child care resource and referral services.

District of Columbia

In 1999, the District of Columbia government conducted its first independent customer satisfaction survey and developed the system to be used for ongoing independent and thorough customer satisfaction assessments. The 1999 survey focused on customer need for and satisfaction with child care during non-traditional hours for child care intake. The non-traditional child care services survey was a postcard, mailed directly to parents with information about non-traditional services, that could be mailed directly back to the unit conducting the survey. There was a 14% return rate, and as a result of this survey a community outreach initiative and provider recruitment plan were initiated. Determination of customer satisfaction with evening hours was implemented through a survey instrument and customer interviews. A written report with recommendations was developed and used to increase customer use of evening services.

Contact:
Barbara Ferguson Kamara, Executive Director
Office of Early Childhood Development
(202) 727-1839
bkamara@dhs.dcgov.org

Georgia

Georgia has increased investments in the Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) network using CCDF set-aside funds. The state now contracts with 10 community-based non-profits and four institutions of higher learning to provide CCR&R services in all of Georgia's 159 counties. During the next 12 months, each CCR&R will be adding an inclusion specialist to its staff to help parents of children with disabilities find care and to help child care providers better serve children with disabilities in their communities. This initiative was developed by a statewide Task Force on Child Care for Children with Disabilities that was co-sponsored by the Georgia Child Care Council, the Governor's Office on Developmental Disabilities, and the state's 0-3 early intervention program called "Babies Can't Wait."

Contact:
Susan Maxwell, Executive Director
Georgia Child Care Council
404-679-4880
susanmaxwell@compuserve.com

Kentucky

Kentucky conducts an annual check of customer satisfaction through the audit process. Parents and providers are surveyed regarding the service they have received. Kentucky's culture is diversified and is becoming more so with many ethnic groups establishing homes in the state. Most of the eligibility staff members live in the communities in which they work. This aids awareness of the cultural needs of families within the communities. In addition, several of the Child Care Resource and Referral agencies are the service agents for the subsidy program. The CCR&R agencies' understanding of and bond with the community helps in this process.

Contact:
Dana Jackson, Director
Division of Child Care
(502) 564-2611
Dana.Jackson@mail.state.ky.us

North Carolina

Child Care Services Association (CCSA) in North Carolina, a not-for-profit agency, provides scholarships to help pay the costs of child care for families living and working in Orange County. Scholarship funds come from Smart Start, United Way, UNC-Chapel Hill, municipal and county governments and private contributions. Applications for child care subsidy are available in all child care programs in the county, county human services agencies, employment centers, shelters and all CCSA offices. Bilingual family support counselors are available for Spanish-speaking families, and all information and applications are available in Spanish. Both initial and annual renewal applications may be mailed or faxed, with appropriate documentation. Annual customer service evaluations of the scholarships and services received from CCSA are performed. In addition, one-third of the CCSA board includes recipients of the agency's services, including families receiving the child care subsidy. The agency offers extended hours, including some evenings and Saturdays.

Contact:
Susan Russell, Executive Director
Child Care Services Association
(919) 967-3272
suer@ipass.net

GOAL 7

Design the subsidy system so that rate structures assure that families receiving child care assistance have access to all types of child care and disallow charges above established co-payments.

Action Steps

7.1. States should cap reimbursement rates at no less than the 75th percentile based on a market rate survey conducted every two years that accurately reflects the price of all types of care in communities across the state.
7.2. Establish and evaluate reimbursement policies that encourage provider participation and are responsive to family needs.
7.3. Prohibit providers from charging above the established co-payments.

Florida

The Gold Seal program was established to promote national accreditation of early care and education programs. Several accrediting associations are involved in the Gold Seal Quality Care Program. Under Gold Seal legislation, facilities that receive a Gold Seal are eligible for higher payment rates for Subsidized Child Care, sales tax exemptions on educational equipment and ad valorum (property tax) exemptions. These incentives not only encourage improved quality but also encourage private child care center participation in the subsidized child care program. This participation allows full mainstreaming of children who qualify for subsidized assistance and provides parental choice of location and setting. Nearly 1,000 child care centers and family child care homes now have received the Gold Seal.

Contact:
Susan Muenchow, Executive Director
The Florida Partnership for School Readiness
(850) 488-0337
muenchs@eog.state.fl.us

Missouri

Missouri has instituted a tiered reimbursement incentive system. Providers are eligible to receive the following percentage increases on their base subsidy rate:

- 30% increase for providers serving a disproportionate share of state subsidized children.
- 20% increase for providers who are accredited by a recognized accrediting organization approved by the state.
- 15% increase for evening and weekend care.
- 25% increase for special needs children.

Missouri also allows providers of special needs children to be paid at the rate associated with their "functional" age.

Contact:
Doris Hallford, Assistant Deputy Director
Missouri Division of Family Services
(573) 522-1385
dhallfor@mail.state.mo.us

Tennessee

To be responsive to family needs for assistance with child care fees above the parent co-payment, the Tennessee Department of Human Services (DHS) will pay providers a one-time application fee of up to $50 per child at the time of enrollment and an annual registration fee of up to $50 per child for children in the Families First and Transitional Families First programs. In addition, DHS established transportation fees to pay a licensed provider for transporting a child in the Families First program to the child care program. DHS will pay providers $10 per week per child for this service.

Contact:
Louis Rudolph, Director of Certificate Program
Tennessee Department of Human Services
(615) 313-4870

West Virginia

In West Virginia, base reimbursement rates were increased in October 2000 to 85th percentile of the 1999 market rate. In addition to increases in base rates, incentive rates of $4 extra per day are added if a provider is accredited or offers care during non-traditional work hours. The enhanced rate for infant and toddlers also is used for children with special needs and children receiving care for child protective services reasons. Two other incentive rates are planned for early 2001. One will provide additional rates of $2 daily to providers who complete a 40-hour infant and toddler training program. The second will provide an additional $2 daily to providers who meet additional requirements but are not yet accredited. This will result in a three-tiered payment system. West Virginia also makes subsidized payments to unlicensed school-age child care programs that register with the state and meet health and safety guidelines.

Contact:
Kay Tilton, Director, Child Day Care Services
Department of Health and Human Resources
(304) 558-7980
ktilton@wvdhhr.org

GOAL 8

Create partnerships with employers to expand child care assistance for working families.

Action Steps

8.1. Educate employers about the bottom line benefits associated with public and private child care assistance.
8.2. Enlist business leaders to champion the involvement of southern businesses and to serve as mentors to other businesses.
8.3. Provide information to employers on all available tax benefits related to child care assistance, including deductions for donations to tax-exempt child care organizations, capital costs for constructing a child care center and establishing a pre-tax dependent care assistance plan.
8.4. Facilitate collaborative initiatives that enable employers to share ideas as well as pool their resources to address child care needs.
8.5. Provide matching funds or other tax or financial incentives for employers to invest in child care.
8.6. Establish incentives for employers to create child care benefit programs for their employees or to contribute to child care purchasing pools in their state or community.
8.7. Reduce the administrative burden on employers participating in any joint public/private child care assistance program.

Arkansas

As a result of the work of the Governor commissioned Arkansas Corporate Champions for Children Initiative, The Early Care and Education Trust Fund will be established during the next legislative session, beginning January 2001. Funds will be available to match contributions from private businesses and individuals. The trust fund will create a new source of funding to address lengthy waiting lists in Arkansas. The Governor's Work-Life Initiative Award will be established and presented in April of each year to recognize and honor employers who support families. This initiative has generated several very important data reports: Children and Child-Care Issues in Arkansas (graphic presentation of 50 child care indicators by county and state summary); the Survey of Employer Onsite Child Care (Eleven sites across the state were surveyed. They tied the success of their projects to recruitment, employee satisfaction and retention.); and the Survey of Family Friendly Policies for Employees in Arkansas. (This survey gives a percentage listing by importance of the policies in place now as well as a percentage of the employers desiring assistance in developing other family friendly options.)

Contact:
Janie Fletcher, Director
Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education
(501) 682-4891
janie.fletcher@mail.state.ar.us

District of Columbia

The District of Columbia has developed public-private partnerships to increase access to child care services for District residents since 1987. Partnerships have been established with Early Childhood Collaborative of DC, Inc., Katharine Graham of The Washington Post and Terrence Golden of the Host Marriott, Donna Klein of Marriot International, Carrie Thornhill of DC Agenda, DC Childcare Corporation, the DC Chamber of Commerce, employers, housing developers, The Banker's Association, community development corporations, the faith-based community and the philanthropic community. These partnerships have resulted in: new licensed capacity in child development centers and homes; increased capacity for infants and school-age children; increased capacity on evenings, overnight, weekends and holidays; increased worksite facilities; increased child care subsidy rates; seminars; expanded roles for child care resource and referral services; and increased training for early care and education providers. Since 1995, the Mayor's Wish List Award has been presented to business partners in recognition of their contributions.

Contact:
Barbara Ferguson Kamara, Executive Director
Office of Early Childhood Development
(202) 727-1839
bkamara@dhs.dcgov.org

Florida

The Florida Partnership for School Readiness, based in the Executive Office of the Governor, is the principal organization responsible for the enhancement of school readiness. Programs are expected to make services available on a full-day, full-year basis to assist working parents. Fifty-seven school readiness coalitions have formed in the last year representing all of Florida's counties. Local county coalitions are comprised of community leaders, school board members, private and faith-based child care providers, Head Start, and child care resource and referral agencies. One-third of the members must not make their living in early education and child care. During this transition year, the coalitions are in the process of assuming the management of the child care funding streams and pre-kindergarten funds with the intent to maximize use of services. Sliding-fee scales apply to all state-funded, out-of-home early education and child care services. Local coalitions have the authority to fund specific school readiness programs, allowing them to tailor funding to the community they serve. Parents have a choice of settings and locations. Performance standards have been established to guide the programs and a uniform screening will be conducted for all children entering kindergarten.

The Florida Child Care Executive Partnership Program is a public-private partnership formed between businesses and the state of Florida to increase the availability of child care for low-income working parents. Under the Child Care Partnership Act, the State of Florida will match dollar-for-dollar child care contributions by employers and local communities for families earning up to 200 percent of the federal poverty level. Participating businesses receive a tax deduction, and parents receive care for about one-third the full cost. Since the program's establishment, more than $32 million in business and local matching funds have been raised, enabling an additional 17,000 children to receive child care tuition assistance. The current state appropriation is $10 million.

Contact: Susan Muenchow, Executive Director
The Florida Partnership for School Readiness
(850) 488-0337
muenchs.@eog.state.fl.us

Georgia

In 1999, Georgia's Governor Roy Barnes sponsored a new corporate tax credit to encourage employers to become partners in meeting the child care needs of their employees. Companies now may recoup 75% of their investment in subsidizing child care for their employees and 100% of their investment, over 10 years, in building onsite child care centers. To assist employers in understanding the tax credit and the impact of child care on the work force, the Georgia Child Care Council developed and distributed a handbook titled Quality Child Care — The Business Connection. Support the Workforce of 2000; Prepare the Workforce of 2020. A Powerpoint presentation specific to Georgia also is available for use with business audiences.

Contact: Susan Maxwell, Executive Director
Georgia Child Care Council
404-679-4880
susanmaxwell@compuserve.com

1776

Tennessee

Tennessee's Corporate/Community Partnership Grant is available to local governments, school districts in partnership with industries, and businesses and/or public or private non-profit agencies that submit a proposal addressing specific, documented child care needs in a community. The grant must be matched one-to-one by the applicant's partner. The Corporate/Community Partnership grant pool totals $200,000. To date, 14 grants totaling $287,444 have been disbursed. In addition, the 101st Tennessee General Assembly authorized the Department of Human Services to explore obtaining federal and state funding to provide an incentive to develop local match funds from local government, employers, charitable institutions and others to create partnerships with employers. The Tennessee Community and Corporate Child Care Partnership Program is designed to enhance child care in local communities. The program will be administered through the Tennessee Child Care Facilities Corporation.

Contact: John Garnett, Executive Director
Tennessee Child Care Facilities Corporation
615-313-4700

Texas

The San Antonio Smart Start Program began as the Corporate Child Care Collaborative in 1994 as a public/private care trust fund to enhance the quality and increase the quantity of area child care services for employees of local businesses and for the community as a whole. In early 1997, the collaborative launched a $50,000 marketing plan to raise awareness and to recruit new corporate members for its activities. The marketing plan features a media campaign with paid TV and magazine advertising, public service announcements, billboards and brochures. All Smart Start projects are conducted in collaboration with other community organizations. Among its most successful initial projects is a program to conduct training and provide support for community child care centers and home-based centers. As a result of the program, 10 centers and 17 family child care programs have received national accreditation. Since its inception, the collaboration has helped 70 child care programs used by employees, benefiting 2,500 child care providers and 4,500 children.

The Texas Work and Family Clearinghouse is committed to helping Texas employers attract and retain a diverse workforce through the promotion and support of dependent care policies and programs in the workplace. The Clearinghouse was mandated by the Texas Legislature to provide information concerning technical assistance, dependent care and other employment-related family issues to public and private employers, state agencies, policymakers and individuals. The Clearinghouse has funded 15 local business collaboratives and one statewide child care resource and referral project in FY2000.

Contact: Nancy Hard, Director
Child Care Services
(512) 463-6473

GOAL 9

Provide child care assistance to working families through federal and state tax laws.

Action Steps

9.1. Make the federal child and dependent care tax credit refundable.
9.2. Establish refundable child and dependent care tax credits in states with income taxes.
9.3. Raise federal and state child care tax credit expense limits to accurately reflect the price of quality care.
9.4. Index for inflation the state and federal child and dependent care tax credit income eligibility and expense limits.
9.5. Ensure that child and dependent care tax credits are clearly identified and easy to claim by filers using either the short or long form.
9.6. Encourage the use of effective state tax strategies to provide financial support for child care.

Arkansas

In Arkansas, Act 1286 of 1993 provided an enhanced income tax credit in the amount of 20% of the federal credit (under IRS code) for qualified taxpayers who incurred child care expenditures at approved child care facilities. The 20% tax credit is refundable. Legislation in 1997 provided the 20% credit for all taxpayers using child care and eliminated the enhanced credit for use of an approved/accredited program. The use of approved/accredited facilities does continue allowance for the 20% to be refundable. Act 820 of 1993 designated and exempted from state tax those corporations that build and equip approved child care centers. Construction materials and furnishings purchased for use in the initial construction and equipping of a child care center for the exclusive purpose of providing child care to employees will be subject to the exemption. A business that qualifies for the exemption from the Gross Receipts Tax shall be allowed an income tax credit of 3.9% of the annual salary of workers employed exclusively in providing child care services. Act 850 of 1995 allowed companies to operate or contract the operation and further allowed two or more companies to participate in a single child care program.

Contact:
Janie Fletcher, Director
Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education
(501) 682-4891
janie.fletcher@mail.state.ar.us

GOAL 10

States should have effective, coordinated systems to guide child care and early childhood policy decisions and direct use of resources.

Action Steps

10.1. Facilitate greater coordination in eligibility policies across child care and early childhood education programs at state and local levels.
10.2. All southern states and the District of Columbia should participate in a collaborative effort to develop and collect common data elements across states.

Arkansas

In the state of Arkansas, collaboration with state-level partners has been the key to progress. Leaders in this collaboration include the Division of Child Care, the Head Start Collaboration Office, the Department of Education, Higher Education, Department of Health, Special Education and the Professional Development workgroups. Arkansas's goal is to establish a coordinated system for early care and education across the state. Clear goals have been set, and the state is currently working on the following projects: The Arkansas Early Childhood Professional Development System; the Early Learning Literacy in Arkansas Training Program for Pre-School Teachers; and a data base of all funding available to communities from the Division of Child Care, Department of Education and Head Start. Governor Mike Huckabee has stated, "We must enlist parents, businesses, public servants and faith-based community members in our efforts to sustain quality early care and education programs for the children of Arkansas."

Contact:
Janie Fletcher, Director
Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education
(501) 682-4891
janie.fletcher@mail.state.ar.us

Georgia

The Georgia Legislature established The Georgia Child Care Council in 1991 to act as a planning and coordinating body for early childhood and school-age care programs. The Council administers and distributes the quality set-aside of the CCDF. Volunteer Council members are appointed by the Governor and by law must represent specific segments of the child care community, including: nonprofit, for-profit and faith-based child care providers; family child care providers; chambers of commerce; child care resource and referral agencies; early childhood academic experts; Head Start; and parents, including those who have a child with a disability. The Lieutenant Governor and the Speaker of the House also appoint members to represent the general public. Ex officio members represent state agencies with responsibilities for or an interest in child care availability and quality. The Council's mission is to influence public policy, elevate public awareness and encourage partnerships in order to make quality child care available and affordable for all Georgians.

Contact:
Susan Maxwell, Executive Director
Georgia Child Care Council
404-679- 4880
susanmaxwell@compuserve.com

Mississippi

The 2000 Mississippi State Legislature established the Early Childhood Services Interagency Coordinating Council made up of leaders of state agencies that provide services to preschool children. This Council and its Advisory Committee are charged with gathering data on early childhood services for the purposes of better coordination of services, identifying gaps in service and measuring progress toward filling those gaps. This Council will issue annual reports, the first of which will be issued to the 2001 State Legislature.

Contact:
Carol Burnett, Director
Office of Children and Youth
(601) 359-5238
cburnett@mdhs.state.ms.us

Missouri

Incentive funding from the Kauffman Foundation in Kansas City and the Danforth Foundation of St. Louis helped to establish an Early Childhood Interagency Team in Missouri consisting of representatives from the Departments of Social Services, Health, Mental Health, Elementary and Secondary Education, Head Start Collaboration, and the Children's Trust Fund. For the past three years, this team has met on a monthly basis and has been instrumental in reducing duplication of services, building critical interagency relationships and maximizing and coordinating resources within the state.

Contact:
Doris Hallford, Assistant Deputy Director
Missouri Division of Family Services
(573) 522-1385
dhallfor@mail.state.mo.us

Tennessee

The Tennessee Children's Interagency Policy Committee was initiated by the governor's office in 1999 to function as an umbrella group to facilitate action and coordination among the various state agencies that serve children. The Committee's major function is to prevent duplication and conflicting agreements and to foster improved coordination among departments for better provision of services. Representatives from the departments of Human Services, Children's Services, Mental Health/Mental Retardation, Health, Education and the Bureau of TennCare comprise the committee.

Contact:
Holly Clark
Assistant to the Governor for Policy
(615) 532-4648

The Tennessee Child Care Management System is a centralized automated child care data base and payment system that includes features that assist child care certificate program staff in maintaining and updating data on providers, parents and children.

Contact:
Louis Rudolph
Director of Certificate Program
(615) 313-4870

Chapter 4

SOUTHERN REGIONAL INITIATIVE ON CHILD CARE AGENDA FOR 2001 AND BEYOND

The Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care worked diligently during 2000 to develop progressive child care assistance policy goals that help families pay for child care. This collaboration has placed the southern states in the position to move forward aggressively.

Beginning in January 2001, the Task Force will set its sights on implementation of the Action Plan set forth in Chapter 3, and it will initiate its work to address additional issues associated with improving access to quality child care. The continuation of the initiative is supported by an additional two-year grant from The David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

One of the cornerstones of the implementation plan is site visits to the states, where briefing sessions will promote awareness and action. During 2001, the Southern Institute on Children and Families will coordinate with members of the Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care and the Staff Work Group members to schedule a site visit to each of the 16 participating southern states and the District of Columbia. Because the scope of child care assistance policy crosses agency and public/private sector lines, representatives invited to participate in the state events will be leaders from public and private entities who are the decision-makers. After presentation of the Action Plan, site visit participants will engage in a discussion to identify opportunities and barriers to achieving the goals and action steps.

Beginning in January 2001, the Task Force will set its sights on implementation of the Action Plan set forth in Chapter 3, and it will initiate its work to address additional issues associated with improving access to quality child care.

Throughout 2001, the Southern Institute will enlist regional and national expertise to conduct research and provide technical assistance to help states address the Action Plan goals. Educational materials will be developed to assist public and private organizations as they work to achieve action on the goals and action steps.

In June 2001, the Southern Institute will survey the 16 southern states and the District of Columbia to determine the status of efforts to implement the Action Plan. Findings of the Southern Institute survey will be compiled into a report, and the results will be utilized in developing an agenda for the Southern Regional Forum on Child Care to be held in October 2001. Invited participants will include members of the Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care, the Staff Work Group, representatives of public and private organizations in the 16 participating states and the District of Columbia, and representatives of the federal government. The Forum agenda will spotlight success stories that have replication potential and also will stimulate dialogue on issues that have impeded implementation of the Action Plan goals and action steps.

The Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care will meet twice during 2001 to monitor progress toward Action Plan implementation and to begin examining issues related to improving access to quality child care. The Staff Work Group will examine the issues related to quality and will guide the development of new strategies for the Task Force consideration.

A report will be prepared in December 2001 outlining the results of the second year of the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care. The report will specify actions that remain to be taken and provide information on lessons learned.

The third year of the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care will include a continuation of efforts to implement the Action Plan developed in the first year. During 2002, site visits will be conducted in four southern states, where child care issues will be the focus of a discussion session with key policymakers, administrators, advocates and business representatives. Technical assistance will continue to be provided on request, and training materials will be updated. State-to-state site visits also will be conducted to allow states that have made significant progress toward implementation of the Action Plan to send a team to visit states that are having difficulty implementing the goals and action steps.

Working together though the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care, southern states will maintain a strong commitment to seek greater investments in helping low-income families obtain access to affordable, quality child care.

As occurred in year two, the Southern Institute will conduct a survey of the 16 southern states and the District of Columbia during the summer months to determine the status of implementation of the Action Plan. A report will outline the findings.

Special events will be held in 2002 to promote dialogue and action around the issues and opportunities identified during the work of the Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care. Preliminary plans envision the convening of the second Southern Regional Forum on Child Care and a meeting of business organizations to raise awareness of the need for employers to be involved with public and private sector programs that help low to moderate income families pay for child care. Additionally, national organizations will be engaged in dialogue regarding lessons learned and approaches to addressing unresolved issues.

Working together though the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care, southern states will maintain a strong commitment to seek greater investments in helping low-income families obtain access to affordable, quality child care. Through sustained attention, this public-private collaboration will facilitate sound decision-making, and the results will contribute to a more stable and productive workforce, reduced welfare dependency and improved school performance.

ENDNOTES

1. Sarah C. Shuptrine, Vicki C. Grant, MSW, PhD, and Genny G. McKenzie, MBA, Southern Regional Initiative to Improve Access to Benefits for Low Income Families With Children (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, February 1998), Chp. 4, pp. 53-71.

2. Louise Stoney, Child Care in the Southern States: Expanding Access to Affordable Care for Low-Income Families and Fostering Economic Development (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, April 2000).

3. Jack P. Shonkoff and Deborah A. Phillips, Editors, Committee On Integrating the Science of Early Childhood Development, Board on Children, Youth and Families, National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development — Executive Summary (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 2000)

4. Rima Shore, Rethinking the Brain: New Insights Into Early Development (New York, NY: Families and Work Institute, 1997).

5. U.S. Department of Labor, Futurework: Trends and Challenges for Work in the 21st Century (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, September 1999).

6. U.S. Census Bureau Report, Growth in Single Fathers Outpaces Growth in Single Mothers (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, December 1998).

7. Louise Stoney, Child Care in the Southern States: Expanding Access to Affordable Care for Low-Income Families and Fostering Economic Development (Columbia, SC: The Southern Institute on Children and Families, April 2000).

8. National Council of Jewish Women, Opening a New Window on Child Care: A Report on the Status of Child Care in the Nation Today (New York, NY: NCJW, 1999).

9. Louise Stoney, Child Care in the Southern States: Expanding Access to Affordable Care for Low-Income Families and Fostering Economic Development (Columbia, SC: The Southern Institute on Children and Families, April 2000).

10. Carnegie Corporation of New York, Starting Points: Meeting the Needs of Our Youngest Children (New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York, August 1994).

11. W.S. Barnett, "Long-Term Effects of Early Childhood Programs on Cognitive and School Outcomes" The Future of Children 5, 3 (1995): 25-50.

12. National Council of Jewish Women, Opening a New Window on Child Care: A Report on the Status of Child Care in the Nation Today (New York, NY: NCJW, 1999).

13. G. Adams and K. Schulman, The South: Child Care Challenges (Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, May 1998).

14. Ibid.

15. Louise Stoney, Child Care in the Southern States: Expanding Access to Affordable Care for Low-Income Families and Fostering Economic Development (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, April 2000).

16. Ibid.

17. G. Adams and K. Schulman, The South: Child Care Challenges (Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, May 1998).

18. Lynne M. Caspar, Who's Minding Our Preschoolers? Fall 1994 Update (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Current Population Reports, Bureau of the Census, November 1997).

19. Hofferth, et al, National Child Care Survey (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1990).

20. Mark Greenberg, Joan Lombardi and Rachel Schumacher, The Child Care and Development Fund: An Overview (Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, April 2000).

21. See Appendix A, Table 16.

22. See Appendix A, Tables 20 and 29.

23. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, Access to Child Care for Low-Income Working Families (Vienna, VA: The National Child Care Information Center, October 1999), 5.

24. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, Access to Child Care for Low-Income Working Families (Vienna, VA: The National Child Care Information Center, October 1999), 4.

25. Ibid.

26. See Appendix A, Table 17.

27. See Appendix A, Table 18.

28. A. Mitchell, L. Stoney and H. Dichter, Financing Child Care in the United States. An Illustrative Catalog of Current Strategies (Philadelphia, PA: The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation and the Pew Charitable Trusts, 1997).

29. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program Federal Funds for FYs 97-99 Transferred in FY 1999 – Through the 4th Quarter. Table D – Percentages of Transfer Amounts to CCDF and SSBG, online at http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofs/data/q499/table-d.htm.

30. National Governors' Association Center for Best Practices, Trends in Improving Services to Children (Washington, DC: NGA, 1998).

31. Op cit.

32. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, Access to Child Care for Low-Income Working Families (Vienna, VA: The National Child Care Information Center, October 1999).

33. Sarah C. Shuptrine, Vicki C. Grant, MSW, PhD, and Genny G. McKenzie, MBA, Southern Regional Initiative to Improve Access to Benefits for Low Income Families With Children (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, February 1998), Chp. 4, pp. 53-71.

34. See Appendix A, Table 1.

35. See Appendix A, Table 6.

36. See Appendix A, Table 8.

37. See Appendix A, Tables 9, 10 and 11.

38. Louise Stoney, Looking Into New Mirrors: Lessons for Early Childhood Finance and System-Building (Dorchester, MA: Horizons Initiative, October 1998).

39. Public Agenda, 2000, Necessary Compromises: How Parents, Employers, and Children's Advocates View Child Care Today (Washington DC: Public Agenda, 2000, 2000).

40. Anne Mitchell, L. Stoney, and H. Dichter, Financing Child Care in the United States: An Illustrative Catalog of Current Strategies (Philadelphia, PA: The Pew Charitable Trusts and the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, 1997).

41. Louise Stoney, Looking Into New Mirrors: Lessons for Early Childhood Finance and System-Building (Dorchester, MA: Horizons Initiative, October 1998).

42. Ibid.

43. Texas Perspectives, Inc., Public Funding of Childcare Services (San Antonio, TX: Texas Perspectives, Inc., 2000).

44. Ibid.

45. M. Rohacek and S. Russell, Child Care $ubsidy: An Investment Strategy for North Carolina (Chapel Hill, NC: Day Care Services Association, December 1996).

46. Louise Stoney and J. Daugherty, Access to Child Care Assistance: A Survey of Sixteen Southern States and the District of Columbia (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, 2000).

47. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, Access to Child Care for Low-Income Working Families (Vienna, VA: The National Child Care Information Center, October 1999).

48. Deborah Parkinson, Work Family Roundtable: Child Care Services (New York City: The Conference Board, Winter 1995).

49. U.S. Department of the Treasury, Investing in Child Care: Challenges Facing Working Parents and the Private Sector Response (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Treasury, 1998).

50. U.S. Department of Labor, Futurework: Trends and Challenges for Work in the 21st Century (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, September 1999).

51. A. Mitchell, L. Stoney and H. Dichter, Financing Child Care in the United States. An Illustrative Catalog of Current Strategies (Philadelphia, PA: The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation and the Pew Charitable Trusts, 1997).

52. Louise Stoney, Child Care in the Southern States: Expanding Access to Affordable Care for Low-Income Families and Fostering Economic Development (Columbia, SC: The Southern Institute on Children and Families, April 2000), 12.

53. Louise Stoney and M. Greenberg, "The Financing of Child Care: Current and Emerging Trends," The Future of Children Vol . 6, No. 2 (Los Altos, CA: The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, 1996).

54. Sarah C. Shuptrine, Vicki C. Grant, MSW, PhD, and Genny G. McKenzie, MBA, Southern Regional Initiative to Improve Access to Benefits for Low Income Families With Children (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, February 1998), Chp. 4, pp. 53-71.

55. See Appendix, Table 25.

56. G. Adams and K. Schulman, The South: Child Care Challenges (Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, May 1998).

Appendix

ACCESS TO CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE A SURVEY OF SIXTEEN SOUTHERN STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Prepared for

The Southern Institute on Children and Families

By

Louise Stoney
Jane Daugherty

Stoney Associates
308 Thais Road
Aberill Park, NY 12018

November 2000

List of Tables

Table 1 Child Care Assistance for Employed TANF Recipients
Table 2 Child Care Assistance for TANF Recipients Who are Looking for Work
Table 3 Child Care Assistance for TANF Recipients in an Approved Training Program
Table 4 Child Care Assistance for TANF Applicants Diverted from Cash Assistance by Job Search and/or Immediate Employment
Table 5 Child Care Assistance for TANF Recipients in Higher Education
Table 6 Child Care Assistance for Former TANF Recipients Who Have Left TANF Due to Earnings
Table 7 Child Care Assistance for Former TANF Recipients Who are Currently Employed and Have Left TANF Due to Time Limits
Table 8 Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible, Employed Families
Table 9 Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible Families Looking for Work at Initial Application
Table 10 Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible Families Between Jobs (i.e. gap in employment while receiving child care subsidies)
Table 11 Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible Families Attending Education or Training Program
Table 12 Child Care Assistance for Children with Special Needs
Table 13 Child Care Assistance for Children in Foster Care
Table 14 Child Care Assistance for Children Receiving Protective/Preventive Care
Table 15 Do you consider the immigration status of the child's parent or guardian when determining eligibility for child-care subsidies?
Table 16 Income Eligibility Ceiling as a Percentage of Statewide Median Income (SMI) (Single Parent with Two Children)
Table 16-A Income Eligibility Ceiling as a Percentage of Federal Poverty Level (FPL) (Single Parent with Two Children)
Table 17 Eligibility Ceilings and Maximum Co-Payment for Family of Three (assumes family of 3 with one infant and one 4-year-old in full-time, center-based care)
Table 18 Co-Payment for Family of Three at Poverty Level (assumes family of 3 with one infant and one 4-year-old in full-time, center-based care)
Table 19 Income Disregarded When Determining Eligibility for Child Care Assistance

Table 20 Funds Available to Meet the Demand for Child Care Assistance
Table 21 State Requirements for Face-to-Face Interview When Applying for Child Care Assistance
Table 22 State Requirements for Face-to-Face Interview When Redetermining Eligibility for Child Care Assistance
Table 23 State Policies Regarding Cooperation with Child Support Enforcement
Table 24 Maximum Frequency of Child Care Eligibility Redetermination (assumes no changes in income or employment during eligibility period)
Table 25 Eligibility Determination for Transitional Child Care
Table 26 Verification Documents Acceptable in Determining and Redetermining Eligibility: Items to Verify Income
Table 27 Verification Documents Acceptable in Determining and Redetermining Eligibility: Items to Verify Age of Child(ren)
Table 28 Verification Documents Acceptable in Determining and Redetermining Eligibility: Other Documents
Table 29 Barriers to Accessing Child Care Assistance
Table 30 Outreach Activities
Table 31 State Income Tax Provisions for Child Care

Table 1
Child Care Assistance for Employed TANF Recipients

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, number of months child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no		yes	yes	no, but all currently served	no		
Arkansas	yes					no		
Delaware	yes					no		must meet income guidelines
District of Columbia	no		yes	yes		no		all eligible are served
Florida	no		yes	no, priority 2	yes	no		
Georgia	no[1]		yes	yes		no		
Kentucky	yes					no		
Louisiana	yes				no	no		
Maryland	no		yes	yes	yes	no		
Mississippi	yes	5 years				no		
Missouri	no		yes	yes	yes, all served	no		
North Carolina	no		yes	locally established priorities	yes	yes		
Oklahoma	no[1]		yes	yes	no, but all served	no		
South Carolina	yes	24 months				no		

---

[1] GA and OK do not have a law or regulation that specifies that child care is guaranteed, but as a matter of state policy child care is "guaranteed" in these states for children whose parents are applicants or recipients of TANF and who need child care to participate in state-approved activities.

Table 1
Child Care Assistance for Employed TANF Recipients

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, number of months child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Tennessee	yes					no		
Texas	yes					no		guaranteed only if parent(s) enrolled in CHOICES (TANF employment program)
West Virginia	no		yes	yes	no	no		

Table 2
Child Care Assistance for TANF Recipients Who are Looking for Work

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, number of months child care assistance is available	Child care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no		yes	yes	no, but all served	no		
Arkansas	yes					no		
Delaware	yes					no		
District of Columbia	no	limited to 3 months	yes	yes	no	no		
Florida	no		yes	no, priority 2	yes	no		
Georgia	no[2]	up to 8 weeks per year, 1st instance no more than 6 weeks	yes	yes		no		time limits for job search are TANF rules, not child care rules
Kentucky	yes					no		no limit if work search is part of approved TANF activity
Louisiana	no					no	yes	
Maryland	no		yes	yes	yes	no		no legal guarantees, but all eligible are served
Mississippi	yes	5 years				no		
Missouri	no		yes	no	no	no		system not TANF-based

---

[2] GA and OK do not have a law or regulation that specifies that child care is guaranteed, but as a matter of state policy child care is "guaranteed" for children whose parents are applicants or recipients of TANF who need child care to participate in state-approved activities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
Child Care Assistance for TANF Recipients Who are Looking for Work

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, number of months child care assistance is available	Child care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
North Carolina	no	initially, up to 30 days; may extend to 60 days with caseworker approval	yes	locally set priorities	yes	yes		
Oklahoma	no[2]		yes	yes	no, but all currently served	no		
South Carolina	yes					no		if attempting to start a TANF component within 2 weeks
Tennessee	yes					no		
Texas	yes					no		guaranteed only if parent(s) enrolled in CHOICES
West Virginia	no		yes	yes		no		

Table 3
Child Care Assistance for TANF Recipients in an Approved Training Program

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, number of months child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no	2 years	yes	yes	no, but all currently served	no		no time limit so long as grades are satisfactory
Arkansas	yes					no		
Delaware	yes					no		
District of Columbia	no	varies by program	yes	yes	no	no		
Florida	no		yes	no, priority 2	yes	no		
Georgia	no[3]		yes[1]	yes[1]		no		
Kentucky	yes					no		
Louisiana	yes					no		must attend job training program – or a combination of job training and employment – for an average of 20 hours a week
Maryland	no		yes	yes	yes	no		no legal guarantee, but all eligible are served
Mississippi	yes	5 years				no		
Missouri	no		yes	no	no	no		system not TANF-based

[3] GA and OK do not have a law or regulation that specifies that child care is guaranteed, but as a matter of state policy child care is "guaranteed" for children whose parents are applicants or recipients of TANF who need child care to participate in state-approved activities.

Table 3
Child Care Assistance for TANF Recipients in an Approved Training Program

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, number of months child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
North Carolina	no		yes	locally set priorities	yes	yes		
Oklahoma	no[3]		yes	yes	no, but all currently served	no		
South Carolina	yes	24 months				no		
Tennessee	yes					no		
Texas	yes	up to 18 months in CHOICES program				no		guaranteed only if parent(s) enrolled in CHOICES
West Virginia	no		yes	yes		no		

Table 4
Child Care Assistance for TANF Applicants Diverted from Cash Assistance by Job Search and/or Immediate Employment

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, number of months child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds are not available MUST be put on waiting list	Policy varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no		yes		yes	no		
Arkansas	yes					no		must be employed at least 30 hours per week
Delaware	yes					no		
District of Columbia	yes	up to 3 months for job search; as long as eligible if immediately employed	yes	yes		no		all immediately employed are served
Florida	no		yes	no, priority 2	yes	no		
Georgia	no[4]	1 year	yes[1]	yes[1]		no		
Kentucky	yes					no		
Louisiana								Louisiana does not have a diversion policy
Maryland	no		yes	yes	yes	no		
Mississippi	yes	5 years				no		
Missouri	no		yes	no	no	no		system not TANF-based
North Carolina	no		yes	locally set priorities	yes	yes		
Oklahoma	no[4]		yes	yes	no, but all	no		

[4] GA and OK do not have a law or regulation that specifies that child care is guaranteed, but as a matter of state policy child care is "guaranteed" for children whose parents are applicants or recipients of TANF who need child care to participate in state-approved activities.

Table 4
Child Care Assistance for TANF Applicants Diverted from Cash Assistance by Job Search and/or Immediate Employment

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, number of months child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds are not available MUST be put on waiting list	Policy varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
					served			
South Carolina	yes	currently 2 weeks*	yes	yes	no	no		*plan to begin funding eligible families for 52 weeks
Tennessee	N/A							Tennessee does not have a diversion policy
Texas	yes	12 months				no		must have received a referral to attend a workforce orientation and must have located employment
West Virginia	no		yes	no	no, but all served			

Table 5
Child Care Assistance for TANF Recipients in Higher Education

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no		yes	yes	no, but all currently served	no		must be in a 2-year program or the last 2 years of a 4-year degree
Arkansas	yes					no		if 2- or 4-year higher education is approved, TANF work activity and family is receiving cash assistance
Delaware	yes					no		policy same for approved 2- and 4-year college
District of Columbia	yes		yes	yes		no		policy same for approved 2- and 4-year college
Florida	no		yes	no, priority 2	yes	no		policy same for approved 2- and 4-year college
Georgia	no					no	yes	higher ed. is not allowed as an exclusive activity
Kentucky	yes					no		education must be an approved TANF activity; may be 2- or 4-year college
Louisiana	yes				no	no		recipient must have higher ed. (2- or 4-year) approved by TANF and must attend college – or a combination of education and employment – for an average of 20 hours a week

Table 5
Child Care Assistance for TANF Recipients in Higher Education

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Maryland	no		yes	no	no	yes		most localities allow only 2-year higher education
Mississippi	no					no	yes	state plan does provide child care for higher education unless family is also meeting work requirement
Missouri	no		yes	no	no	no		policy same for approved 2- and 4-year college
North Carolina	no	24 months	yes	locally established priorities	yes	yes		
Oklahoma	no[5]		yes	yes	no, but all currently served	no		
South Carolina	yes					no		
Tennessee	yes					no		must be enrolled as a full-time higher education student
Texas	yes	time limits vary by locality				only time limits vary		guaranteed only if parent(s) enrolled in CHOICES
West Virginia	no		yes	no	no, but all currently served	no		

---

[5] OK does not have a law or regulation that specifies that child care is guaranteed, but as a matter of state policy child care is "guaranteed" for children whose parents are applicants or recipients of TANF who need child care to participate in state-approved activities.

Table 6
Child Care Assistance for Former TANF Recipients Who Have Left TANF Due to Earnings

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no		yes	no	yes	no		must apply within 6 months after leaving TANF in order to avoid waiting list
Arkansas	yes	up to 36 months				no		
Delaware	yes	as long as meet income guidelines				no		
District of Columbia	no	as long as eligible	yes		no	no		all eligible who apply are currently served
Florida	no	24 months	yes	no, priority 3	yes	no		
Georgia	no[6]	12 months TCC plus continued services	yes	yes		no		"seamless" services if family remains income-eligible
Kentucky	yes	12 months				no		family must remain employed with income at or below 85% of SMI
Louisiana	yes	up to 3 months				no		
Maryland	no		yes	yes	yes	no		
Mississippi	yes	12 months				no		

[6] GA does not have a law or regulation that specifies that child care is guaranteed, but as a matter of state policy child care is "guaranteed" for children whose parents are applicants or recipients of TANF who need child care to participate in state-approved activities.

Table 6
Child Care Assistance for Former TANF Recipients Who Have Left TANF Due to Earnings

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Missouri	no		yes	no	no	no		system not TANF-based
North Carolina	no		yes	locally set priorities	yes	yes		must meet eligibility criteria of employment, education, CWS, CPS or developmental needs
Oklahoma	no[6]		yes	yes	no, but all currently served	no		
South Carolina	yes	24 months				no		
Tennessee	yes	18 months				no		must have some paid employment and total hours of activity must be 20 hours or greater
Texas	yes	12 months transitional				no		entitled to 18 months transitional if exempt from CHOICES and voluntarily participated
West Virginia	no		yes	yes	no, but all are served	no		

Table 7
Child Care Assistance for Former TANF Recipients Who are Currently Employed and Have Left TANF Due to Time Limits

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no		yes	yes	no			must apply within 6 months of leaving TANF to avoid waiting list
Arkansas	no		yes	no	yes	no		
Delaware	yes					no		
District of Columbia	no	not limited	yes		no	no		
Florida	no		yes	no, priority 3	yes	no		
Georgia	no		yes			no		family may receive child care assistance if they meet income and employment/ training eligibility criteria
Kentucky	yes	12 months				no		child care is assured if family is employed, earning less than 85% of the SMI, and leaves TANF for any reason
Louisiana	no		yes			no		
Maryland	no		yes	no	yes	no		
Mississippi	yes	12 months				no		
Missouri	no		yes	no	no	no		
North Carolina	no		yes	locally set priorities	yes	yes		

Table 7
Child Care Assistance for Former TANF Recipients Who are Currently Employed and Have Left TANF Due to Time Limits

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Oklahoma	no		yes	no, priority 2	no, but all served	no		
South Carolina	yes	up to 24 months				no		individuals who become employed within two years of losing TANF assistance due to time limits may apply for transitional child care once they become employed; if they remain eligible, may receive child care for 2 years
Tennessee	yes	18 months				no		work, education and training may be combined to equal full-time employment
Texas	no		yes	no	yes	no		
West Virginia	no		yes	no	no	no		system based on income eligibility, regardless of TANF status

Table 8
Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible, Employed Families

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no		yes	no	yes	no		
Arkansas	no		yes	no	no	no		
Delaware	no		yes	no	yes	no		
District of Columbia	no		yes	no	no	no		
Florida	no		yes	no, priority 3	yes	no		
Georgia	no		yes	no	no	no		
Kentucky	no		yes	no	no	no		
Louisiana	no		yes	no	no	no		
Maryland	no		yes	no	yes	no		
Mississippi	no		yes	no	yes	no		
Missouri	no		yes	no	no	no		
North Carolina	no		yes	locally set priorities	yes	yes		
Oklahoma	no		yes	no, priority 2	no, but all currently served	no		
South Carolina	no		yes	no	no	no		
Tennessee	no		yes	no	yes	no		

Table 8
Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible, Employed Families

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Texas	no		yes	no	yes	no		policy regarding priority for services does not vary, but income limits for eligibility do vary by locality
West Virginia	no		yes	no	no, but all eligibles served	no		system based on income eligibility, regardless of TANF status

Table 9
Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible Families Looking for Work at Initial Application

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	For how long if family meets income eligibility criteria	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no					no	yes	
Arkansas	no	10 days	yes	no	yes	no		
Delaware	no					no	yes	
District of Columbia	no	12 weeks	yes	no	no	no		
Florida	no	not limited by state	yes	no, priority 3	yes	no		
Georgia	no					no	yes	
Kentucky	no					no	yes	recipients who have already secured but not begun employment when they apply may receive child care subsidies for up to 2 weeks prior to starting the job if the care otherwise would be lost
Louisiana	no					no	yes	
Maryland	no	1 month	yes	no	no	no		
Mississippi	no	not limited by state	yes	no	yes	no		
Missouri	no	not limited by state	yes	no	no	no		
North Carolina	no	not limited by state	yes	locally set priorities	yes	yes		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 9
Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible Families Looking for Work at Initial Application

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	For how long if family meets income eligibility criteria	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Oklahoma	no						yes	
South Carolina	no						yes	recipients who have already secured but not begun employment when they apply may receive child care subsidies for up to 2 weeks prior to starting the job if the care otherwise would be lost
Tennessee	no						yes	
Texas	no						yes	
West Virginia	no					no	yes	

Table 10

Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible Families Between Jobs

(i.e. gap in employment while receiving child care subsidies)

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no					no	yes	
Arkansas	no	10 days	yes	yes	no	no		
Delaware	no	1 month	yes	no	yes	no		
District of Columbia	no	12 weeks	yes	no	no	no		
Florida	no	1 month	yes	no, priority 3	no	no		
Georgia	no	2 weeks	yes	yes	no	no		
Kentucky	no	1 month	yes	no	no	no		
Louisiana	no		no			no	yes	
Maryland	no	1 month	yes	no	yes	no		
Mississippi	no	2 months	yes	yes	no	no		
Missouri	no	30 days	yes	no	no	no		
North Carolina	no	initially, up to 30 days; may extend to 60 days with caseworker approval	yes	locally set priorities	yes	yes		
Oklahoma	no		no		no, but all currently served	no	yes	
South Carolina	no	1 month	yes	yes	no	no		

Table 10
Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible Families Between Jobs
(i.e. gap in employment while receiving child care subsidies)

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Tennessee	no	1 month	yes	no	yes	no		
Texas	no		no			no	yes	
West Virginia	no	1 month	yes	yes	no	no		

Table 11
Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible Families Attending Education or Training Program

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no		yes	no	yes			higher education only eligible if it is 2-year program or the last 2 years of a 4-year degree
Arkansas	no		yes	no	no	no		
Delaware	no		yes	no	yes	no		
District of Columbia	no		yes	no	no	no		
Florida	no		no			no	yes	
Georgia	no		yes	no	yes	no		teen parents attending high school/GED program are given priority
Kentucky	no		yes	no	no	no		
Louisiana	no		yes	no	no	no		must attend job training program – or a combination of job training and employment – for an average of 20 hours a week
Maryland	no		yes	no	yes	yes		some areas do not allow 4-year college
Mississippi	no		yes	no	yes	no		full-time students are not required to meet a work requirement, but part-time students must work at least 10 hours a week
Missouri	no		yes	no	no	no		
North Carolina	no		yes	locally set priorities	yes	yes		limited to a total of 2 years if enrolled in post-secondary education

Table 11
Child Care Assistance for Income-Eligible Families Attending Education or Training Program

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Oklahoma	no		yes	no, priority 3	no	no, but all currently served		up to 4 years of college
South Carolina	no		yes	yes	no	no		
Tennessee	no		yes	no	yes	no		education or training must be full-time
Texas	no	varies by locality	yes	no	yes	no		priority for services does not vary, but time limits for eligibility vary by locality
West Virginia	no		yes	no	no	no		job training/education defined as on-the-job training, CWEP, vocational training, secondary school programs, post-secondary school programs, colleges and universities; also count 1 to 3 hours of study time per hour of classroom activity

Table 12
Child Care Assistance for Children with Special Needs

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no		yes	no	yes			
Arkansas	no		yes	no	no	no		no rate differential
Delaware	no		yes	yes	yes	no		
District of Columbia	no		yes	yes	no	no		no income limit
Florida	no		yes	no	no	no		not treated as special needs for certification, but differential payment rate
Georgia	no		yes	yes	no	no		
Kentucky	no		yes	no	no	no		family must be income-eligible
Louisiana	no		yes	no	no	no		
Maryland	no		yes	yes, within each priority category	yes	no		family must be income-eligible
Mississippi	no		yes	no, priority 2	yes	no		higher reimbursement rates
Missouri	no		yes	yes	yes	no		no sliding fee; rates based on developmental age of child
North Carolina	no		yes	locally set priorities	yes	yes		

Table 12
Child Care Assistance for Children with Special Needs

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Oklahoma	no		yes	yes	no, but all served	no		higher reimbursement rate; parent of child on SSI has no co-pay
South Carolina	no		yes	yes	no	no		different eligibility criteria (medical expenses deducted from income); state has special needs "set-aside"
Tennessee	yes	18 months				no		no parental employment required; higher income limit (75% of the SMI)
Texas	no		yes	no	yes	no		
West Virginia	no		yes	yes	no	no		must be income-eligible; higher payment rate

Table 13
Child Care Assistance for Children in Foster Care

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no		yes	yes		no		
Arkansas	yes					no		child care is guaranteed only if child care is reflected in the case management plan; family does not have to be income-eligible; funds from SSBG or IV-B
Delaware	no		yes	no	yes	no		
District of Columbia	no		yes	yes	no	no		no income limit
Florida	no		yes	yes	all children served; top priority	no		yes, foster parent must be employed unless otherwise specified in therapeutic plan
Georgia	no[7]		yes[1]	yes[1]	yes	no		foster parents must be working or in education/training
Kentucky	no		no	no	N/A	no		paid from different funding source and administered separately
Louisiana	no		yes	no	no	no		
Maryland	N/A							child care for this group provided by another system

---

[7] Georgia does not have a law or regulation that guarantees child care. However, as a matter of state policy child care is "guaranteed" for children who are in the custody of the Department of Family and Children Services; children who are in court-ordered supervision where child care is part of the court order/case plan; and children in families with open Child Protective Services cases where child care is part of the case plan.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 13
Child Care Assistance for Children in Foster Care

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Mississippi	no		yes	no	yes	no		
Missouri	no		yes	no	no	no		need for child care must be specified as part of case plan
North Carolina	no		yes	locally set priorities	yes	yes		
Oklahoma	yes		yes	yes	no, but all served	no		available for working foster parents but not those in school
South Carolina	no		yes	yes	no	no		foster parents must be working or in school; no fee charged
Tennessee	no		yes	yes	yes	no		no income test or parental employment required
Texas	yes		no					children up to age 19 eligible; guaranteed only if referred by protective service worker; funding for children in protective services is provided by CPS agency
West Virginia	no		yes	no	no	no		foster parents must be working or in school; parents' income is disregarded

Table 14
Child Care Assistance for Children Receiving Protective/Preventive Care

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
Alabama	no		yes	yes	no			
Arkansas	yes					no		child care is guaranteed only if child care is required by the case management plan
Delaware	no		yes	yes	yes	no		
District of Columbia	yes		yes	yes	no	no		
Florida	no		yes	yes	yes	no		top priority by statute
Georgia	no[8]		yes[1]	yes[1]		no		
Kentucky	yes					no		protective care is guaranteed, regardless of income; preventive care must meet income eligibility guidelines
Louisiana	no		yes	no	no	no		
Maryland	no		yes	no	yes	no		funding for these children is available through social services
Mississippi	no		yes	no	yes	no		
Missouri	no		yes	no	no	no		

---

[8] Georgia does not have a law or regulation that guarantees child care. However, as a matter of state policy child care is "guaranteed" for children who are in the custody of the Department of Family and Children Services; children who are in court-ordered supervision where child care is part of the court order/case plan; and children in families with open Child Protective Services cases where child care is part of the case plan.

Table 14
Child Care Assistance for Children Receiving Protective/Preventive Care

State	Child Care is guaranteed by law or regulation	If limited, length of time child care assistance is available	Child Care provided only if funds available	Child Care provided only if funds available, BUT group is given top priority	If funds not available, MUST be put on waiting list	Varies across localities	Family not eligible	Special policies or restrictions
North Carolina	no		yes	most localities make CPS a priority	yes	yes		
Oklahoma	no		yes	yes	no, but all served	no		
South Carolina	no		yes	yes	no	no		child care assistance provided regardless of income
Tennessee	no		yes	yes	yes	no		
Texas	yes					no		
West Virginia	yes		no			no		guaranteed only if referred by protective service worker; funding for children in protective services provided by CPS agency

Table 15

Do you consider the immigration status of the child's parent or guardian when determining eligibility for child-care subsidies?

Alabama	no
Arkansas	yes, parent must be a citizen or in the country legally
Delaware	no, if child is U.S. citizen
District of Columbia	no
Florida	yes
Georgia	no
Kentucky	no
Louisiana	yes
Maryland	no
Mississippi	no
Missouri	no
North Carolina	no, not if child is U.S. citizen
Oklahoma	no
South Carolina	yes
Tennessee	yes, parent must be citizen or legal alien
Texas	no
West Virginia	no

Table 16
Income Eligibility Ceiling as a Percentage of Statewide Median Income (SMI)
(Single Parent with Two Children)

State	Statewide Median Income (family of 3)		Income Eligibility Ceiling At Initial Application (Entry)			Income Eligibility Ceiling At Redetermination (Exit) If Different		
	Annually	Monthly	Annually	Monthly	As % of SMI	Annually	Monthly	As % of SMI
Alabama	$40,522	$3,377	$18,048	$1504	45%	$27,756	$2,313	68%
Arkansas	$32,463	$2,705	$22,404	$1,867	69%			
Delaware	$53,064	$4,422	$27,768	$2,314	52%			
District of Columbia	$47,145	$3,929	$27,924	$2,327	59%			
Florida	$41,927	$3,494	$21,228	$1,769	51%	$28,296	$2,358	67%
Georgia	$43,385	$3,615	$24,276	$2,023[9]	56%			
Kentucky	$38,668	$3,222	$22,200	$1,850[10]	57%			
Louisiana	$38,713	$3,226	$29,040	$2,420	75%			
Maryland	$55,867	$4,656	$25,140	$2,095	45%			
Mississippi	$35,480	$2,957	$30,156	$2,513	85%			
Missouri	$43,830	$3,653	$17,784	$1,482	41%			
North Carolina	$43,504	$3,625	$32,628	$2,719	75%			
Oklahoma	$37,198	$3,100	$23,232	$1,936[11]	62%			
South Carolina	$41,714	$3,476	$20,820	$1,735	50%	$24,288	$2,024	58%
Tennessee	$40,525	$3,377	$24,324	$2,027	60%			

---

[9] If this family had a child with special needs, the income ceiling would be $2,334 per month.

[10] If this family were leaving TANF to enter the workforce (i.e. in Transitional Child Care) the income ceiling would be $2,739 per month.

[11] This is net income. The gross income ceiling would be $2,420 (or 77% of the SMI) after the 20% earned income deduction is applied and could be even higher if other income deductions applied.

Table 16
Income Eligibility Ceiling as a Percentage of Statewide Median Income (SMI)
(Single Parent with Two Children)

State	Statewide Median Income (family of 3)		Income Eligibility Ceiling At Initial Application (Entry)			Income Eligibility Ceiling At Redetermination (Exit) If Different		
	Annually	Monthly	Annually	Monthly	As % of SMI	Annually	Monthly	As % of SMI
Texas	$40,326	$3,360	$34,272	$2,856[12]	85%	local option[13]	local option	
West Virginia	$36,681	$3,057	$28,296	$2,358	77%			

---

[12] The statewide ceiling is 85% of the SMI, but some localities have a lower income limit for initial eligibility. Income figures are for SFY 2000 and will increase based on ACF Issuance: LIHEAP-IM-2000-11.

[13] Some localities have established a higher income eligibility ceiling at redetermination.

Table 16-A
Income Eligibility Ceiling as a Percentage of Federal Poverty Level (FPL)[14]
(Single Parent with Two Children)

State	Income Eligibility Ceiling At Initial Application (Entry)			Income Eligibility Ceiling At Redetermination (Exit) If Different		
	Annually	Monthly	As % of FPL	Annually	Monthly	As % of FPL
Alabama	$18,048	$1504	128%	$27,756	$2,313	196%
Arkansas	$22,404	$1,867	158%			
Delaware	$27,768	$2,314	196%			
District of Columbia	$27,924	$2,327	197%			
Florida	$21,228	$1,769	150%	$28,296	$2,358	200%
Georgia	$24,276	$2,023[15]	172%			
Kentucky	$22,200	$1,850[16]	157%			
Louisiana	$29,040	$2,420	205%			
Maryland	$25,140	$2,095	178%			
Mississippi	$30,156	$2,513	213%			
Missouri	$17,784	$1,482	126%			
North Carolina	$32,628	$2,719	231%			
Oklahoma	$23,232	$1,936[17]	164%			
South Carolina	$20,820	$1,735	147%	$24,288	$2,024	172%
Tennessee	$24,324	$2,027	172%			

---

[14] Based on 2000 Federal Poverty Level of $14,150 per year for a family of three.

[15] If this family had a child with special needs, the income ceiling would be $2,334 per month.

[16] If this family were leaving TANF to enter the workforce (i.e. in Transitional Child Care) the income ceiling would be $2,739 per month.

[17] This is net income. The gross income ceiling would be $2,420 (or 77% of the SMI) after the 20% earned income deduction is applied and could be even higher if other income deductions applied.

Table 16-A
Income Eligibility Ceiling as a Percentage of Federal Poverty Level (FPL)[14]
(Single Parent with Two Children)

State	Income Eligibility Ceiling At Initial Application (Entry)			Income Eligibility Ceiling At Redetermination (Exit) If Different		
	Annually	Monthly	As % of FPL	Annually	Monthly	As % of FPL
Texas	$34,272	$2,856[18]	242%[17]	local option[19]	local option	
West Virginia	$28,296	$2,358	200%			

---

[18] The statewide ceiling is 85% of the SMI, but some localities have a lower income limit for initial eligibility.
[19] Some localities have established a higher income eligibility ceiling at redetermination.

Table 17
Eligibility Ceilings and Maximum Co-Payment for Family of Three
(assumes family of 3 with one infant and one 4-year-old in full-time, center-based care)

State	Income Eligibility Ceiling			Maximum Co-Payment			Provider can charge rate supplement
	Annually	Monthly	As % of SMI	Annually	Monthly, for both children	As % of Income	
Alabama	$18,048	$1,504[20]	45%	$2,076	$173	12%	yes
Arkansas	$22,404	$1,867	69%	$5,976	$498[21]	27%	no
Delaware	$27,768	$2,314	52%	$8,388	$699	30%	yes, if no state contract
District of Columbia	$27,924	$2,327	59%	$5,688	$474	20%	no
Florida	$21,228	$1,769 [22]	51%	$1,872	$156	9%	yes
Georgia	$24,276	$2,023[23]	56%	$3,120	$260	13%	yes
Kentucky	$22,200	$1,850	57%	$2,208	$184	10%	yes
Louisiana	$29,040	$2,420	75%	$5,940	$495	20%	yes
Maryland	$25,140	$2,095	45%	$5,688	$474[24]	23%	yes
Mississippi	$30,156	$2,513	85%	$2,280	$190	8%	yes
Missouri	$17,784	$1,482	41%	$2,076	$173	12%	yes, except CPS
North Carolina	$32,628	$2,719	75%	$2,940	$245	9%	yes
Oklahoma	$23,232	$1,936[25]	62%	$2,628	$219	11%[26]	no

[20] This family would remain eligible for child care assistance until its income exceeded $2,313 a month, or 68% of the SMI.

[21] Co-payments vary by rate area; amount included in table is an estimate based on the average price of child care for the hypothetical family.

[22] This family would remain eligible for child care assistance until its income exceeded $2,358 a month, or 67% of the SMI.

[23] Higher eligibility for children with special needs.

[24] Co-payments are based on the cost of care in a local market. $474 would be the highest co-payment in the most expensive of the state's seven regions. The state average co-payment for a family of three with two children in full-time, center-based care is $334 a month, or 16% of income.

[25] This is net income. The gross income ceiling would be $2,420 (or 77% of the SMI) after the 20% earned income deduction is applied and could be even higher if other income deductions applied.

[26] The parent fee would be only 9% of income if based on gross income after the earned income deduction is applied.

Table 17
Eligibility Ceilings and Maximum Co-Payment for Family of Three
(assumes family of 3 with one infant and one 4-year-old in full-time, center-based care)

State	Income Eligibility Ceiling			Maximum Co-Payment			Provider can charge rate supplement
	Annually	Monthly	As % of SMI	Annually	Monthly, for both children	As % of Income	
South Carolina	$20,820	$1,735[27]	50%	$936	$78	4%	yes
Tennessee	$24,324	$2,027	60%	$2,904	$242	12%	yes
Texas	$34,272	$2,856	85%	$3,768	$314[28]	11%	no
West Virginia	$28,296	$2,358	77%	$1,296	$160	7%	no

---

[27] This family would remain eligible for child care assistance until its income exceeded $2,024 a month or 58% of the SMI.

[28] Co-payments vary across localities; this is an estimate.

Table 18
Co-Payment for Family of Three at Poverty Level
(assumes family of 3 with one infant and one 4-year-old in full-time, center-based care)

State	Co-payment, for both children			Provider can charge rate supplement
	Annually	Monthly	As % of Income	
Alabama	$1,560	$130	11%	yes
Arkansas	none	none	0%	no
Delaware	$2,196	$183	16%	yes, if center not under state contract
District of Columbia	$888	$74	6%	no
Florida	$1,248	$104	9%	yes
Georgia	$420	$35	3%	yes
Kentucky	$1,164	$97	8%	yes
Louisiana	$2,292	$191	16%	yes
Maryland	$108	$9	.07%	yes
Mississippi	$684	$57	5%	yes
Missouri	$1,044	$87	7%	yes, except for CPS
North Carolina	$1,272	$106	9%	yes
Oklahoma	$888	$74	6%	no
South Carolina	$732	$61	5%	yes
Tennessee	$828	$69	6%	yes
Texas	$1,560	$130[29]	11%	no
West Virginia	$516	$43	4%	no

Assumptions: Poverty level income for family of three is $14,150 per year, or $1,179.17 per month. Daily rates converted to monthly rates by multiplying by 5 days a week and 4.3 weeks a month.

---

[29] Fees vary across localities; this is an estimate.

Table 19
Income Disregarded When Determining Eligibility for Child Care Assistance

Alabama	food Stamps, foster care subsidies, energy assistance checks, in-kind income
Arkansas	$100 per working adult
Delaware	none
District of Columbia	TANF payments, SSI
Florida	child support if court-ordered
Georgia	SSI, tax refunds, gifts, value of food stamps, income of children, energy assistance payments, work expenses, adoption supplement, TANF, housing subsidies
Kentucky	SSI, any income solely to child, any one-time payment
Louisiana	earned income tax credit, in-kind income and full amount of foster care payments, $2,200 per child disregarded for minor parent's family or for relative caretakers
Maryland	TANF payments, SSI, tax refunds, food stamps, child support from non-custodial parent up to $2,200 per child
Mississippi	only income from employment is considered when determining eligibility for child care assistance; all other income is disregarded
Missouri	health insurance premiums
North Carolina	28 income disregards, including: Work First Family Assistance, SSI, lump sum payments, food subsidies, foster care assistance payments, adoption assistance payments, loans, grants, scholarships, Section VIII housing subsidies, in-kind contributions, employee benefits for child care, etc.
Oklahoma	20% earned income deduction, legally binding child support paid outside the home, government rent or housing subsidies, irregular income of less than $30 per calendar quarter, some lump sum payments, in-kind income, money from sale of property, bank or trust account withdrawals, capital gains, earnings of children, reimbursements, tax refunds, money from third parties, loans, grants that preclude their use for living expenses, educational assistance, IV-E adoption subsidies, SCORE and ACE income, income excluded by federal law
South Carolina	SSI, work expenses, foster care payments, income from property sold, loans and grants, tax refunds, gifts, insurance payments, food stamps, work/study income
Tennessee	yes, child support paid by custodial parent and food stamps
Texas	food stamps
West Virginia	loans, gifts, lump sum income, grants & scholarships

Table 20
Funds Available to Meet the Demand for Child Care Assistance

State	Would your state have the funding to meet the demand if all eligible families applied for child care assistance in your state?
Alabama	no
Arkansas	no
Delaware	no
District of Columbia	no
Florida	no
Georgia	no
Kentucky	no
Louisiana	no
Maryland	no
Mississippi	no
Missouri	no
North Carolina	no
Oklahoma	no
South Carolina	no
Tennessee	no
Texas	no
West Virginia	not without TANF transition funds

Table 21
State Requirements for Face-to-Face Interview When Applying for Child Care Assistance

State	Is a face-to-face interview required in order for a family to initially receive child care subsidies? (yes, no, varies by locality)	If no, can eligibility be determined via phone, fax, US mail or email?
Alabama	yes	
Arkansas	yes	
Delaware	yes, but can be waived for 30 days in case of transportation hardship	
District of Columbia	yes	
Florida	no, but highly recommended for additional R&R services	all
Georgia	yes	
Kentucky	no	all
Louisiana	no	US mail
Maryland	no state policy; varies by locality	US mail
Mississippi	no	US mail, fax
Missouri	no	US mail, fax, phone
North Carolina	not required by state, but most counties require them	US mail (for signature), phone (for interview)
Oklahoma	no	US mail, phone (mandatory interview)
South Carolina	no	US mail, fax, phone
Tennessee	yes	
Texas	no	US mail and fax (for documents), phone
West Virginia	yes	

Table 22
State Requirements for Face-to-Face Interview When Redetermining Eligibility for Child Care Assistance

State	For redetermination of eligibility for child care subsidy, is a face-to-face interview required?	If no, can redetermination be done via phone, fax, US mail or email?
Alabama	yes	
Arkansas	no	US mail, phone or fax
Delaware	no	all
District of Columbia	yes	
Florida	no, but recommended	all
Georgia	yes	
Kentucky	no	all
Louisiana	no	US mail
Maryland	no state policy; varies by locality	US mail
Mississippi	no	US mail, fax
Missouri	no	US mail, fax, phone
North Carolina	not required by state, but most counties require them	US mail (for signature), phone (for interview)
Oklahoma	no	US mail, phone (mandatory interview)
South Carolina	no	US mail, fax, phone
Tennessee	yes	
Texas	no	US mail and fax (for documents), phone
West Virginia	no	US mail, fax

Table 23
State Policies Regarding Cooperation with Child Support Enforcement

State	Does your state require that applicants for child care assistance cooperate with child support enforcement?
Alabama	no
Arkansas	yes
Delaware	no
District of Columbia	yes
Florida	yes
Georgia	no
Kentucky	no
Louisiana	no
Maryland	yes
Mississippi	no
Missouri	no
North Carolina	no
Oklahoma	yes
South Carolina	no
Tennessee	no
Texas	yes
West Virginia	no

Table 24

Maximum Frequency of Child Care Eligibility Redetermination

(assumes no changes in income or employment during eligibility period)

State	TANF Recipients	Income-Eligible Families
Alabama	6 months	6 months
Arkansas	6 months	6 months
Delaware	12 months if participating in employment activities	6 months
District of Columbia	no limit if eligible for TANF	6 months
Florida	6 months	6 months
Georgia	12 months	12 months
Kentucky	12 months	12 months
Louisiana	6 months	6 months
Maryland	12 months	12 months
Mississippi	12 months	12 months
Missouri	12 months	12 months
North Carolina	12 months	12 months
Oklahoma	12 months	12 months
South Carolina	12 months	12 months
Tennessee	6 months	6 months
Texas	varies[30]	6-12 months[31]
West Virginia	6 months	6 months

---

[30] TANF recipients enrolled in CHOICES remain eligible until their CHOICES case is closed by the CHOICES case manager.
[31] Frequency of redetermination varies by regional boards; most localities determine eligibility every 6 or 12 months.

Table 25
Eligibility Determination for Transitional Child Care

State	Recertification **not** required	Recertification required	Can recertification be done by phone, fax, mail or email?
Alabama		recertification required	
Arkansas			
Delaware	transfer is automatic		all
District of Columbia	transfer is automatic		
Florida		recertification required	all
Georgia	transfer is automatic; TANF worker verifies income and transfers case (no parent interview required)		
Kentucky		recertification required — conducted by TANF caseworker	all
Louisiana		recertification required	US mail
Maryland		recertification required based on income	US mail
Mississippi	transfer is automatic — TANF caseworker sends "change in TANF status" form to the designated agent		
Missouri		N/A; TANF and income-eligible child care merged; no separate transitional child care program	US mail, fax, phone
North Carolina		N/A; TANF and income-eligible child care merged; no separate transitional child care program	US mail (for signature), phone (for interview)
Oklahoma		recertification required	US mail, phone (mandatory interview)
South Carolina	transfer is automatic		US mail, fax, phone

Table 25
Eligibility Determination for Transitional Child Care

State	Recertification not required	Recertification required	Can recertification be done by phone, fax, mail or email?
Tennessee		recertification required within 6 months	
Texas	transfer is automatic; local boards determine transitional eligibility based on documents provided by TANF caseworker		US mail, fax (for documents), phone
West Virginia		recertification required if there is a job change	US mail, fax

Table 26
Verification Documents Acceptable in Determining and Redetermining Eligibility: Items to Verify Income

State	Income can be declared; no proof required	Paycheck stub	Employer statement of pay	Tax return, if self-employed	Other income verification
Alabama		✓	✓	✓	✓child support, Social Security, SSI, TANF
Arkansas		✓ (4)	✓	✓	✓child support
Delaware		✓	✓	✓	
District of Columbia		✓	✓	✓	✓child support, SSI
Florida		✓	✓	✓	✓ SSI, TANF, child support
Georgia		✓	✓	✓	
Kentucky		✓	✓	✓	
Louisiana		✓	✓	✓	✓ all unearned income
Maryland		✓(3)	✓	✓	
Mississippi		✓	✓(initial application only)	✓(initial application only)	
Missouri		✓	✓	✓	
North Carolina		✓	✓	✓	✓[32]
Oklahoma	✓ for 30 days only in initial application	✓(2 months)	✓	✓	
South Carolina	✓ foster parents only	✓	✓	✓	Various proofs for self-employed (e.g. cash register receipts from hair stylists)
Tennessee		✓	✓	✓	

---

[32] Self-employed applicants may be required to supply business records or account records.

Table 26
Verification Documents Acceptable in Determining and Redetermining Eligibility: Items to Verify Income

State	Income can be declared; no proof required	Paycheck stub	Employer statement of pay	Tax return, if self-employed	Other income verification
Texas		✓	✓	✓	
West Virginia		✓	✓	✓	Social Security Income, copies of court orders

✓ Item is ACCEPTED for verification.
✚ Item is REQUIRED for verification.
Items are required for both initial application and recertification unless otherwise noted.

Table 27
Verification Documents Acceptable in Determining and Redetermining Eligibility: Items to Verify Age of Child(ren)

State	Ages can be declared; no proof required	Birth Certificate	School Record	Other age verification
Alabama		✓	✓	family Bible
Arkansas	✓			
Delaware	✓			
District of Columbia		✓		if birth certificate is not available, passport is acceptable as proof of birth
Florida	✓			
Georgia	✓			
Kentucky		✓	✓	driver's license, ID card, medical records for children and adults
Louisiana		✚		
Maryland		✓		
Mississippi	✓			
Missouri		✓	✓	passport, family Bible, or 3rd party
North Carolina	✓			
Oklahoma	✓			
South Carolina	✓			
Tennessee		✓	✓	family Bible or immigration forms
Texas	✓			
West Virginia	✓			

✓ Item is ACCEPTED for verification.
✚ Item is REQUIRED for verification.
Items are required for both initial application and recertification unless otherwise noted.

Table 28
Verification Documents Acceptable in Determining and Redetermining Eligibility: Other Documents

State	Verify family unit/child's relationship to applicant	Child support enforcement order	Social Security numbers for all family members	School or training schedule (if student)	Verify residence in state or county	Proof of immunization for child(ren) in care	Other proofs or verifications
Alabama			✓	✓	✓state		
Arkansas		✓	✓	✓	✓		
Delaware			✓	✓	✓(if on border of two-state town)	✓	
District of Columbia	✓		✓	✓	+	✓	
Florida	✓	✓	✓	✓	+phone/utility bill		
Georgia				✓			
Kentucky			✓(initial application only)	✓	✓(initial application only)	✓	
Louisiana		✓	✓	✓			✓citizenship/alien status
Maryland	✓notarized declaration	✓		✓	✓utility bill, etc.	✓	
Mississippi				✓could be report card or enrollment documentation			
Missouri	✓	✓(initial application only)	✓	✓	✓license, utility bill, 3rd party		
North Carolina		✓		✓			✓citizenship/green card
Oklahoma		✓	✓	✓	only if		✓if child is not a citizen,

Table 28
Verification Documents Acceptable in Determining and Redetermining Eligibility: Other Documents

State	Verify family unit/child's relationship to applicant	Child support enforcement order	Social Security numbers for all family members	School or training schedule (if student)	Verify residence in state or county	Proof of immunization for child(ren) in care	Other proofs or verifications
					questionable		need proof of child's status
South Carolina				✓			
Tennessee	✓	✓for TANF (initial application only)	✓(initial application only)	✓	✓(initial application only)		
Texas				✓	✓		
West Virginia		✓		✓			

✓ Item is ACCEPTED for verification.
✚ Item is REQUIRED for verification.
Items are required for both initial application and recertification unless otherwise noted.

Table 29
Barriers to Accessing Child Care Assistance

State	In your opinion, what is the single most difficult part of the process for families seeking child care subsidies?
Alabama	not enough money; verification document
Arkansas	not enough money to serve all families
Delaware	initial application process burdensome; proofs and coming to office
District of Columbia	health form and finding placements for infants
Florida	limited funds; requirement to meet all federal mandates for funding; providers frustrated with the bureaucracy involved in serving subsidized children
Georgia	limited dollars and lack of transportation in rural areas
Kentucky	not enough money to bring income eligibility up to 200% of FPL; difficulty in verifying eligibility determination information
Louisiana	families providing all required verification
Maryland	getting documentation in on time for child care to begin
Mississippi	not enough money to serve a significant percentage of those who apply
Missouri	lack of funding to increase income-eligibility ceiling
North Carolina	getting to county Department of Social Services during business hours
Oklahoma	finding child care providers who will accept subsidy payments, then paying until subsidy begins
South Carolina	no access to subsidies on an on-going basis; too many over income limits
Tennessee	limited funds to serve the low-income eligible population
Texas	limited dollars; non-TANF families face long waiting lists
West Virginia	intake; appointments must be scheduled only during business hours

Table 30
Outreach Activities

State	Efforts to inform TANF families about the availability of child care subsidies	Efforts to inform income-eligible families about the availability of child care subsidies	State has established a toll-free number for applicants for child care subsidies	State has expanded hours for intake workers, to include evenings and weekends	State has conducted a consumer-satisfaction survey
Alabama	TANF agency informs applicants about child care assistance	some regional child care management agencies conduct outreach but no statewide policy	yes, regionally	no	no
Arkansas	one-stop centers, local coalition outreach campaign, distributing information in public places, pilot electronic payment system, media campaign for quality care, CCR&R outreach statewide, website information for parents	same as for TANF	yes	no	no
Delaware	all TANF applicants informed as part of process	flyers, public information campaign, video, information on buses, info. at CHIPS	yes	yes	no
District of Columbia	community meetings, bus posters, outreach at festivals, work with faith-based community, eight-minute informational video available in every public library and health clinic, information available at bank branches, letter to TANF applicants	same as for TANF	yes, single access number	yes	yes, in 1999
Florida	formation of 57 local	same as for TANF	yes, regionally;	yes, varies by location	yes, annually

Table 30
Outreach Activities

State	Efforts to inform TANF families about the availability of child care subsidies	Efforts to inform income-eligible families about the availability of child care subsidies	State has established a toll-free number for applicants for child care subsidies	State has expanded hours for intake workers, to include evenings and weekends	State has conducted a consumer-satisfaction survey
	coalitions, web-based simplified point of entry, local presence via workforce development boards and central agencies		statewide July 2001		
Georgia	public awareness campaign, R&Rs reach families, coordinate with high schools, parks	same as for TANF	no	yes	no
Kentucky	R&Rs do public awareness, pamphlets, parent meetings, posters	same as for TANF	no	yes, evening hours in some areas; no weekend hours	limited number of random calls to clients in June 2000
Louisiana	none	none	no	no	no
Maryland	statewide I&R for parents looking for child care, social service workers informed about child care possibilities, child care subsidy information available at public schools, kindergartens, Pre-Ks and all social service offices, planning major outreach campaign, child care subsidy workers go to job sites, planning state brochures	same as for TANF	no	yes	no
Mississippi	media campaign, applications available at multiple locations, simplified application process	same as for TANF	yes	no	no
Missouri	statewide R&R campaign for	same as for TANF	no	no	no

Table 30
Outreach Activities

State	Efforts to inform TANF families about the availability of child care subsidies	Efforts to inform income-eligible families about the availability of child care subsidies	State has established a toll-free number for applicants for child care subsidies	State has expanded hours for intake workers, to include evenings and weekends	State has conducted a consumer-satisfaction survey
	quality child care, periodic mailings, brochures, community outreach through schools, information on website				
North Carolina	some local agencies offer extended evening hours, some take applications at community sites, some do outreach, publish information in local newspapers, information on a division website, some counties allow parents to sign application at child care center	same as for TANF	available in some counties	available in some counties	not statewide, but some counties have conducted them
Oklahoma	outreach campaign, distributing information in public places, pilot electronic payment system	same as for TANF	no	yes, county option	no, but some counties survey
South Carolina	caseworkers inform TANF families about child care subsidies.	use "enhanced providers" to distribute applications, R&Rs, WIC-outreach, family-night programs	yes, but can't handle all the calls	yes	yes, in August, September and October 1999
Tennessee	posters, pamphlets, notices in businesses and social service agencies, counseling during application process	same as for TANF	yes	yes	yes, in 1999

Table 30
Outreach Activities

State	Efforts to inform TANF families about the availability of child care subsidies	Efforts to inform income-eligible families about the availability of child care subsidies	State has established a toll-free number for applicants for child care subsidies	State has expanded hours for intake workers, to include evenings and weekends	State has conducted a consumer-satisfaction survey
Texas	local boards run career centers (one-stop, easy access resource rooms with staff to help potential child care subsidy recipients); statewide R&R, website	same as for TANF	all local boards have established local 800 numbers for intake and public inquiries	hours are not set by the state, but most local boards have expanded intake hours	surveys not done at state level, but some localities have conducted consumer-satisfaction surveys
West Virginia	new social services web page has child-care eligibility guidelines, working on online application form with income-eligibility calculator	same as for TANF	no	no	no

Table 31
State Income Tax Provisions for Child Care[33]

State	Type of child care provision	Description	Refundable	Is there an income cap?	Maximum benefits (1 dependent/2 or more dependents)
Alabama	none				
Arkansas	credit	20% of federal credit	no, except for care for 3- to 5-year-olds in accredited center	no	$144 / $288
Delaware	credit	50% of federal credit	no	no	$360 / $720
District of Columbia	credit	32% of federal credit	no	no	$230 / $461
Florida		N/A; no state personal income tax			
Georgia	none				
Kentucky	credit	20% of federal credit	no	no	$144 / $288
Louisiana[2]	credit	10% of federal credit, up to $25	no	no	$25 / $25
Maryland[3]	deduction	expenses eligible for federal credit	no	no	$117 / $234[4]
Maryland	credit	beginning in tax year 2001, 32.5% of federal credit if federal AGI less than or equal to $40,000, reduced by 10% for each $1,000 or fraction thereof by which federal AGI exceeds $40,000	no	$50,000 federal AGI	$234 / $468
Mississippi	none				

---

[33] Source: National Women's Law Center, 2000, "Making Child Care Less Taxing: Improving State Child and Dependent Care Tax Provisions," Washington, DC.

[2] Louisiana: In contrast, Louisiana offers a credit for expenses undertaken for "dependents physically or mentally incapable of self-care" equal to 100 percent of the federal credit.

[3] Maryland: Beginning in tax year 2000, Maryland families may claim both the deduction and the credit.

[4] Maryland: Maryland's top tax rate is 4.875 percent.

Table 31
State Income Tax Provisions for Child Care[33]

State	Type of child care provision	Description	Refundable	Is there an income cap?	Maximum benefits (1 dependent/2 or more dependents)
Missouri	none				
North Carolina	credit	13% of expenses eligible for federal credit for care for children under 7, 9% for children over 7, if federal AGI is less than $25,000; 11.5% of eligible expenses for care for children under 7, 8% for children over 7 if AGI is $25,001-$40,000; 10% of eligible expenses for care for children under 7, 7% for children over 7, if AGI is more than $40,000[5]	no	no	$312 / $624
Oklahoma	credit	20% of federal credit actually received though if state AGI is less than federal AGI, credit is prorated	no	no	$144 / $288
South Carolina	credit	7% of expenses eligible for federal credit	no	no	$168 / $336
Tennessee		N/A; no state personal income tax			
Texas	none				
West Virginia	none				

---

[5] North Carolina: The applicable income ranges very with taxpayer filing status. The figures given above are for married taxpayers filing jointly.

SOUTHERN INSTITUTE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
1821 HAMPTON STREET
COLUMBIA, SC 29201
(803) 779-2607

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Unita Blackwell
Chairman
President Emeritus
National Conference of Black Mayors
Mayersville, Mississippi

Sarah C. Shuptrine
President
Southern Institute on Children
and Families
Columbia, South Carolina

Michael N. Castle
Congressman At Large, Delaware
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC

Marian Wright Edelman
President
Children's Defense Fund
Washington, DC

Reuben M. Greenberg
Chief of Police
Charleston Police Department
Charleston, South Carolina

Washington Clark Hill
Director, Maternal-Fetal Medicine
Sarasota Memorial Hospital
Sarasota, Florida

Judy Langford
Senior Consultant
Family Resource Coalition
Chicago, Illinois

Ray Marshall
Rapoport Centennial Chair in
Economics and Public Affairs
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

F. David Mathews
President and CEO
The Kettering Foundation
Dayton, Ohio

Paul M. Starnes
President
Star Trend Products
Chattanooga, Tennessee

Beegie Truesdale
Producer
Los Angeles, California

The Southern Institute on Children and Families is an independent nonprofit public policy organization. It endeavors to improve opportunities for children and families in the South with a focus on disadvantaged children. Through special projects and surveys, the Southern Institute on Children and Families spotlights health, social, education and economic issues of regional significance. It works to encourage public/private sector collaboration on behalf of children and families and seeks to remove bureaucratic and other barriers that restrict access to needed services. The Southern Institute on Children and Families is funded through grants and contributions.

Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care
Southern Institute on Children and Families Project Staff

Zenovia Vaughn
Deputy Director for Child Care
Southern Institute on Children and Families
1821 Hampton Street
Columbia South Carolina 29201
Phone: 803/779-2607 Fax: 803/254-6301
E-mail: zenovia@kidsouth.org

Kristine Hartvigsen
Communications Director
Southern Institute on Children and Families
1821 Hampton Street
Columbia South Carolina 29201
Phone: 803/779-2607 Fax: 803/254-6301
E-mail: kristine@kidsouth.org

Lynn Ammons
Executive Assistant
Southern Institute on Children and Families
1821 Hampton Street
Columbia South Carolina 29201
Phone: 803/779-2607 Fax: 803/254-6301
E-mail: lynn@kidsouth.org

THE SOUTHERN INSTITUTE
on Children and Families

1821 Hampton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Voice: 803-779-2607 Fax: 803-254-6301
http://www.kidsouth.org